UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernlanguagere07modeuoft

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

VOLUME VII

1912

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
C. F. CLAY, Manager

Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET
Paris: LIBRAIRIE HACHETTE AND Cie.
Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., Ltd

All rights reserved

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN LITERATURE AND PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

G. C. MACAULAY

AND

H. OELSNER

VOLUME VII

128396
19/6/13.

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1912

PB
1
M65
v.7

INDEX.

ARTICLES. PAGE

ADAMS, JOSEPH QUINCY, Jr., Notes on Ben Jonson, from a Seventeenth Century Common-Place Book 296

ALEXANDER, HENRY, The Genitive Suffix in the First Element of English Place-Names 64

BARBIER, PAUL, FILS, Les Noms romans de l'*Oblata melanurus*,' Cuv. 441

BARNOUW, A. J., Chaucer's 'Milleres Tale' 145

CLASSEN, E., On the Pronunciation of 'S' in Germanic . . . 314

FOX, J. C., The Earliest French Apocalypse and Commentary . . 445

FREUND, JULIUS, Unbekannte Jugendgedichte von Carl Friedrich Cramer 351

HUGHES, A. M. D., Shelley's 'Zastrozzi' and 'St Irvyne' . . . 54

HUGHES, A. M. D., Shelley's 'Witch of Atlas' 508

KASTNER, L. E., The Italian Sources of Daniel's 'Delia' . . . 153

KASTNER, L. E. and AUDRA, E., Some Unpublished Poems of Drummond from the Hawthornden MSS. 300

LÖWENSTEIN, AGNES, The Sources of Hebbel's 'Agnes Bernauer.' III 330

MAYHEW, A. L., On Some Etymologies of English Words . . 318, 499

MONTGOMERY, MARSHALL, Hölderlin and 'Diotima' 193

MOORE, SAMUEL, The Prologue to Chaucer's 'Legend of Good Women' in Relation to Queen Anne and Richard 488

SCHAAFFS, G., Zwei Friederikenlieder 469

SKEAT, WALTER W., 'Elegy on the Death of King Edward I.' From a new MS. 149

SPEARING, EVELYN M., Donne's Sermons, and their Relation to his Poetry 40

STEEVES, HARRISON ROSS, 'The Athenian Virtuosi' and 'The Athenian Society' 358

TOYNBEE, PAGET, The Centenary of the Completion of Cary's 'Dante' 326

WARD, H. G., Richardson's Character of Lovelace 494

WILLIAMS, W. H., The Date and Authorship of 'Jacke Jugeler' . 289

TEXTS.

BAKER, A. T., An Anglo-French Life of St Osith, II, III . . 74, 157

BROWN, CARLETON, Lydgate's Verses on Queen Margaret's Entry into London 225

TOYNBEE, PAGET, The Vatican Text (*Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat.* 1729) of the Letters of Dante 1

TOYNBEE, PAGET, The S. Pantaleo Text of Dante's Letters to the Emperor Henry VII, and to the Princes and Peoples of Italy . 208

TOYNBEE, PAGET, The Venetian Text (*Cod. Marc. Lat. XIV*, 115) of Dante's Letter to the Emperor Henry VII 433

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

PAGE

Allen, Hope Emily, A Note on Tennyson's 'Morte d'Arthur' . . 99
Bensly, Edward, Pope's 'Rape of the Lock' 94
Bensly, Edward, Pope's 'Windsor Forest,' ll. 65, 66 . . . 97
Berthon, H. E., 'Mettre au Rancart' 101
Brereton, J. Le Gay, Notes on 'A Knack to know an Honest Man' 236
Brereton, J. Le Gay, Stage-arrangement in Peele's 'David and Bethsabe,' I, i 373
Bruce, J. Douglas, Two Notes on 'The Merry Wives of Windsor' 239
Carré, J. M., Two Unpublished Poems of W. S. Landor . . . 375
Coulton, G. G., 'Piers Plowman,' One or Five 372
Cunliffe, John W., The Original 'Romeo and Juliet' . . . 517
Kastner, L. E., On Certain Poems of the Hawthornden MSS. . 98
Kemp-Welch, Alice, Dante and the 'Mahabharata' 243
Moorman, F. W., A Herrick reading 519
Patterson, R. F., 'Paindemaine' 376
Petsch, Robert, A Jest of Goldoni's in Goethe's 'Faust' . . . 100
Thomas, P. G., Drummond and Browne 241
Tuttle, Edwin H., Hispanic 'alteru' and 'altu' 377
Weekley, Ernest, The Etymology of 'roister' 518
Wells, John Edwin, Fielding's Choice of Signature for 'The Champion' 374
Wells, John Edwin, Fielding's Signatures in 'The Champion' and the Date of his 'Of Good-Nature' 97
Williams, W. H., 'Ralph Roister Doister' and 'The Wasps' . . 235

DISCUSSIONS.

Bradley, Henry, The name of the letter ȝ 520
Coulton, G. G., 'Piers Plowman,' One or Five 102
Verrier, P., English Metric 522

REVIEWS.

Armitage, L., Introduction to the Study of Old High German (R. A. Williams) 275
Carpenter, H. C. A., Die Deklination in der Nordhumbrischen Evangelien-übersetzung der Lindisfarner Hs. (A. O. Belfour) . . . 266
Chinard, G., L'Exotisme américain dans la littérature française au XVI^e^ siècle (A. Tilley) 536
Clarke, M. G., Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period (Allen Mawer) 126
Cleveland, John, The Poems of, edited by John M. Berdan (G. C. Macaulay) 553
Deloney, Thomas, The Works of, edited by Francis Oscar Mann (H. V. Routh) 561
Dimnet, E., Les Sœurs Brontë (Grace E. Hadow) 556
Dryden, J., The Poems of, edited by J. Sargeaunt (G. R. Noyes) . 117
Dryden, J., Selected Dramas of, edited by G. R. Noyes (A. W. Verrall) 255
Duff, E. Gordon, The English Provincial Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders to 1557 (Charles Sayle) 545

REVIEWS *cont.* PAGE

Eccles, F. Y., A Century of French Poets, edited by (T. B. Rudmose-Brown) 130
Fiedler, H. G., Das Oxforder Buch deutscher Dichtung (J. G. Robertson) 414
Frederick James Furnivall, A Volume of Personal Record (G. C. Macaulay) 262
Greg, W. W., Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602 (E. K. Chambers) 547
Guy, H., Histoire de la Poésie française au XVI^e^ siècle, I (André Barbier) 407
Hedgcock, F. A., David Garrick et ses amis français (H. F. Stewart) 387
Hedgcock, F. A., Thomas Hardy (H. F. Stewart) 390
Hemingway, Samuel B., English Nativity Plays (E. K. Chambers) . 546
Hertz, W., Gottfrieds von Strassburg Tristan und Isolde (R. Petsch) . 413
Hexaplar Psalter, The, edited by W. A. Wright (G. C. Macaulay) . 248
Homer's Odyssey, translated by H. B. Cotterill (T. S. Omond) . 257
Hudson, W. H., Introduction to the Study of Literature (J. W. H. Atkins) 396
Jacoby, G., Herder als Faust (R. Petsch) 538
Jost, K., Beon und Wesan (P. G. Thomas). 268
Kaluza, M., Short History of English Versification (W. J. Sedgefield) . 123
Klein, D., Literary Criticism from the Elizabethan Dramatists (J. W. H. Atkins) 251
Koszul, A., La Jeunesse de Shelley (A. M. D. Hughes) . . . 383
Lewis, C. B., La Lyre d'Amour (André Barbier) 406
Luce, Morton, Rich's Apolonius and Silla (G. C. Moore Smith) . 552
Lydgate, J., The Serpent of Division, ed. by H. N. MacCracken (J. W. H. Atkins) 253
MacCallum, M. W., Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background (F. S. Boas) 110
Martens, K., Literatur in Deutschland (Karl Holl) 416
Moorman, F. W., Robert Herrick (F. S. Boas) 381
Moorman, F. W., West Riding Place-Names (Allen Mawer) . . 264
Nibelung Men, The Lay of the, translated by A. S. Way (F. E. Sandbach) 540
Onions, C. T., A Shakespeare Glossary (G. C. Macaulay) . . . 559
Petit, L. D., Bibliographie der Middelnederlandsche taal- en letterkunde, II (R. Priebsch) 277
Pollard, P., Masks and Minstrels of New Germany (Karl Holl) . 416
Pope, M. K., and Lodge, E. C., Life of the Black Prince (P. Studer) 402
Pound, E., The Spirit of Romance (W. P. Ker) 127
Saintsbury, G., Historical Manual of English Prosody (G. C. Macaulay) 542
Schipper, J., A History of English Versification (G. C. Macaulay) . 391
Scrittori d' Italia, Vols. I, X, XII, XIV, XVI, XIX, XXIV (C. Foligno) . 410
Seneca, The Tragedies of, translated by F. J. Miller (E. M. Spearing) . 246
Smithson, G. A., The Old English Christian Epic (A. R. Skemp) . 379
Soergel, A., Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit (Karl Holl) . . . 416
Spenser, E., Minor Poems, edited by E. de Sélincourt (G. C. Macaulay) 114
Stewart, H. F., and Tilley, A., The Romantic Movement in French Literature (H. E. Berthon) 269

REVIEWS *cont.* PAGE

Stork, C. W., William Rowley (R. B. McKerrow) 548
Strachey, G. L., Landmarks in French Literature (A. Tilley) . . 397
Thomas, A. B., Moore en France (J. J. Champenois) . . . 272
Thomas, E. J., Danish Conversation-Grammar (Allen Mawer) . . 134
Trehearne, T., Poems of Felicity, ed. H. I. Bell (W. Lewis Jones) . 555
Viglione, F., Ugo Foscolo in Inghilterra (C. Foligno) 132
Ward, A. W., and Waller, A. R., The Cambridge History of English Literature, VI (F. E. Schelling) 105
Wildhagen, Karl, Der Cambridger Psalter (A. O. Belfour) . . . 557
Wilson, J. D., Life in Shakespeare's England (G. C. Moore Smith) . 249
Witkowski, G., Die Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur seit 1830 (Karl Holl) 416
Wolff, S. L., The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction (G. C. Moore Smith) 550

MINOR NOTICES.

Burns, R., Poems published in 1786 423
Bradsher, Earle, Mathew Carey, Editor, Author and Publisher . . 565
Chatterton, Th., The Rowley Poems, edited by M. Hare . . . 423
Cory, H. E., The Critics of Edmund Spenser 135
Cowl, R. P., An Anthology of Imaginative Prose 566
Dante, Divina Commedia, II, Purgatorio, edited by C. H. Grandgent 421
„ „ „ translated by Sir S. W. Griffith . . 565
Collison-Morley, L., Giuseppe Baretti 422
Gray, C. H., Lodowick Carliell 567
Harper, C. A., Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser . 279
Schalfejew, P., Die volkstümliche Dichtung A. Kol'covs . . . 135
Wordsworth, W., Lyrical Ballads 423

NEW PUBLICATIONS 137, 280, 425, 568

THE VATICAN TEXT (*COD. VAT.-PALAT. LAT.* 1729) OF THE LETTERS OF DANTE.

§ I.

THROUGH the kindness of Dr Moore, Editor of the Oxford Dante, who presented me with a photographic reproduction, and generously waived his own claims in my favour, I have been enabled to make a transcript of the text of the nine letters attributed to Dante which are contained in the MS. in the Vatican (*Cod. Vaticano-Palatino Latino* 1729), to which public attention was first called by Karl Witte, in an article in a German periodical, more than seventy years ago[1].

The history of this MS., so far as it has been recovered, is an interesting one. The MS., which, besides the letters of Dante, contains the twelve eclogues of Petrarch, and Dante's *De Monarchia*[2], was executed in the fourteenth century, apparently for Francesco da Montepulciano[3], a Tuscan notary of distinction, the friend and correspondent of Coluccio Salutati, and successor of Filippo Villani in the Chancellorship of Perugia, who at the end of the eclogues has written his name, and the date 20 July, 1394[4]. Francesco da Montepulciano left his books to the capitular library of the Cathedral of Montepulciano, the greater part of which was destroyed by fire in 1539[5], but this MS. by some chance came into the possession of the Florentine scholar, Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459)[6], whence it eventually passed into the

[1] In 1838, in his article *Neu aufgefundene Briefe des Dante Allighieri* (in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, Nos. 149—51), which was afterwards reprinted in *Dante-Forschungen*, I, 473—87.

[2] This was one of the MSS. which was utilised by Witte in his edition of the treatise published at Vienna in 1874 (see p. lviii).

[3] Francesco de' Piendibeni, or, to give him his full description, Francesco di Ser Jacopo di Ser Piendibene da Montepulciano (see F. Novati, *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, III, 312, n. 2; and O. Zenatti, *Dante in Firenze*, pp. 378 ff.).

[4] *Francisci de Montepolitiano. Expleui corrigere* 20 *Iulii Perusii* 1394 (see Witte, *ubi supra*; and Zenatti, *op. cit.*, p. 374). For an enumeration of the portions of the MS. written in the hand of Francesco, see Zenatti, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

[5] See F. Novati, *Le Epistole di Dante*, in *Lectura Dantis: Le Opere Minori di D. A.*, p. 300.

[6] See Zenatti, *op. cit.*, pp. 370—5 note, 414—19; see also below, p. 14.

collection of the celebrated bibliophile, Ulrich Fugger (1526–1584)[1], son of Raimund Fugger, one of the famous merchant-princes of Augsburg. Ulrich Fugger, whose extravagance in the matter of books was such that at one time his family obtained a decree to restrain his expenditure, as is well known, became a Protestant, and to escape persecution took refuge in the Rhenish Palatinate, and settled at Heidelberg, where he died in 1584, leaving his extensive collection of MSS. to the library of that city. After the capture of Heidelberg by Tilly in 1622 the most valuable portion of the library, consisting of nearly 200 cases of MSS., was presented by Maximilian I of Bavaria, in return for the papal support, to Pope Gregory XV, and was transferred to Rome, and incorporated in the Vatican Library, under the superintendence of Leone Allacci[2].

Among the MSS. thus removed to the Vatican were many which had formed part of the Fugger collection, one of them being the MS. containing the nine letters attributed to Dante, which are the subject of the present article. In the Vatican this MS. appears to have lain practically unnoticed until 1837, when a German student, Theodor Heyse, who was collating MSS. of the *Divina Commedia* in the library on behalf of Witte, examined its contents and communicated to the latter a copy of the Dante letters contained in it. Witte thereupon wrote an account of the letters in the article (in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*) already referred to[3], and prepared to publish them. But while he was engaged upon the work his portfolio containing the transcript was stolen from him, and it was more than two years before he could succeed in getting fresh copies made[4]. In the meantime, attention having been directed to the MS. by the publication of Witte's article above mentioned, one of the employés at the Vatican Library, Massi by name, took copies of the letters on his own account with the intention of anticipating Witte's projected edition. Massi, however,

[1] See Zenatti, *op. cit.*, pp. 372—4 note.

[2] Allacci, who was subsequently librarian of the Vatican (1661–9), has left an interesting account of his proceedings at Heidelberg (see Curzio Mazzi, *Leone Allacci e la Palatina di Heidelberg*, Bologna, 1893). Some idea of the extent of the collection may be gathered from the fact that Allacci estimated that the covers alone, which to facilitate transport he caused to be stripped from the MSS., amounted to thirteen waggon-loads. (*Op. cit.* p. 25.)

[3] See above, p. 1, n. 1. In this article Witte omitted to mention the name of the student to whom the discovery was due, an omission which he did not repair until four years later, in 1842, in which year he acknowledged his indebtedness to Heyse in the Appendix to the second part of *Dante Alighieri's lyrische Gedichte, übersetzt und erklärt von K. L. Kannegiesser und K. Witte* (p. 234).

[4] For this second transcript Witte was indebted once more to Theodor Heyse (see *Le Lettere di Dante scoperte dal Signor Teodoro Heyse*, in Vol. II, p. 701 of Niccolò Tommaseo's edition of the *Divina Commedia*, Milano, 1865).

was unable to obtain the necessary *imprimatur*, and he then (in the autumn of 1841) offered his copies to Alessandro Torri of Pisa, who had been for some time engaged upon an edition of the minor works of Dante. Torri availed himself of the offer, and forthwith proceeded to Rome for the purpose of collating the copies with the original MS. in the Vatican; and having satisfied himself as to their accuracy he included the nine letters in his volume, *Epistole di Dante Allighieri edite e inedite*, which was published at Leghorn in the following year (1842)[1].

Torri's edition of the letters, the text of which was severely criticised by Witte[2], was followed in 1857 by a revised edition by Fraticelli, in which were embodied the results of a fresh collation of the MSS. by Witte, who having been prevented from publishing his own projected edition, placed his notes at the disposal of Fraticelli[3]. Fraticelli's text was reprinted (with a few variations) by Giuliani in 1882, and subsequently in the several editions (1894, 1897, 1904) of the Oxford Dante[4].

In the subjoined transcript of the Vatican text the contractions of the MS. have been expanded, the expansions being printed in italics in the usual way. The punctuation of the MS., such as it is, has been preserved. The folios of the MS. [56ro—62ro] are indicated in the transcript; as are the lines (numbered in round brackets) of each separate folio. For convenience of reference each letter has been broken up into paragraphs, numbered [in square brackets] to correspond with the numbering of the sections in the Oxford Dante[5]; and the titles and colophons, which in several instances follow on continuously with the text in the MS., have been detached from the body of the letter, and printed as separate paragraphs. In all other respects the arrangement of the text in the MS. has been reproduced in the transcript.

[1] See Witte, *Dante-Forschungen*, I, 489—90; and Torri, *op. cit.*, pp. vii—viii.

[2] In his article, *Torris Ausgabe von Dantes Briefen*, in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, 1843, No. 341 (reprinted in *Dante-Forschungen*, I, 488—99).

[3] Fraticelli writes in his *Proemio*: 'Il dotto alemanno prof. Witte...non pago di quanto avea fatto la prima volta, volle di nuovo riscontrare i codici e confrontare le varie lezioni; e nuovamente portando il suo esame critico sopra ogni frase ed ogni parola del testo, potè rettificare molti passi disordinati, rendere intelligibili varie frasi oscure, e correggere parecchi e parecchi errori. E quantunque del suo accurato lavoro avess' egli determinato valersi per una ristampa, pure per un tratto d' impareggiabil cortesia ha voluto esserne con me liberale, affinchè io me ne giovassi per l' edizione presente. La lezione dunque del testo latino, che or per me si produce, è interamente al Witte dovuta' (*Opere minori di Dante*, ed. 1893, Vol. III, p. 408).

[4] See below, p. 5.

[5] The line-references in quotations from Dante's prose-works are to the lines as numbered in the Oxford Dante.

Each letter is provided with an *apparatus criticus* in which are registered variant readings from other MSS. (where available)[1], and from the various printed editions, and appended to each is a trial list of proposed emendations—in the Oxford text (the latest), in the case of the six letters contained in that edition; and in the text of Torri and Giuliani, in the case of the so-called Battifolle letters (see below, pp. 19—20). The letters are naturally dealt with in the order in which they occur in the MS.

§ II.

Epistola VII (To the Emperor Henry VII).

Dante's letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII) is one of the three specially mentioned by Giovanni Villani in the biographical notice of Dante in his *Cronica*, where he says:

'Quando fu in esilio fece da venti canzoni morali e d' amore molto eccellenti, e in tra l' altre fece tre nobili pistole; l' una mandò al reggimento di Firenze dogliendosi del suo esilio sanza colpa[2]; l' altra mandò allo 'mperadore Arrigo quand' era all' assedio di Brescia[3], riprendendolo della sua stanza, quasi profetizzando; la terza a' cardinali italiani, quand' era la vacazione dopo la morte di papa Clemente, acciocchè s' accordassono a eleggere papa Italiano[4]; tutte in latino con alto dittato, e con eccellenti sentenzie e autoritadi, le quali furono molto commendate da' savi intenditori' (IX, 136)[5].

The Latin text of this letter has been preserved in two other MSS., besides the Vatican MS., namely in one of the fourteenth century (*Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8) in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome[6], and in a fifteenth century Venetian MS., formerly in the Biblioteca Muranese, now in the Marciana (*Cod. Marc. Lat.* XIV, 115)[7].

This letter was first printed (in a very corrupt and mutilated form) in an early Italian translation, attributed to Marsilio Ficino, which has been preserved in a number of MSS.[8], in the *Prose Antiche di Dante*,

[1] I have unfortunately been unable as yet to procure a collation of *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 at Rome (see below, and p. 32).

[2] *Epist.* VI. [3] Actually, Cremona. [4] *Epist.* VIII.

[5] In the early editions of Villani this chapter is numbered 135.

[6] This MS. also contains the Latin text of Dante's letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy (*Epist.* V). See *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S. II (1895), p. 23 n.

[7] This is the MS. from which Witte first printed the Latin text in 1827. Witte's attention having been drawn to the fact that extracts from the letter in Latin were printed in the Catalogue of the Biblioteca Muranese, search was made, through the kind offices of the Marchese Gian Giacomo Trivulzio, by the Abate Giovanni Antonio Moschini, the Prefetto of the Biblioteca Marciana, whither the spoils of the Murano library had been transferred, with the result that the MS. containing the letter was discovered, and placed at Witte's disposal for the purposes of his projected edition of Dante's letters. (See *Dantis Allighierii Epistolae quae exstant*, cum notis Caroli Witte, Patavii, 1827, pp. 28—9.) I am in possession of a photographic reproduction of the text of *Epist.* VII in this MS., for the execution of which I am indebted to the kindness of Mr Horatio F. Brown.

[8] There are four MSS. in the Riccardiana at Florence alone (see Fraticelli, *Opere Minori di Dante*, ed. 1893, Vol. III, p. 462 n.).

Petrarcha, et Boccaccio (pp. 9—12), published at Florence in 1547 by Doni; and it was reprinted by him at Venice in 1552 in his *Zucca* (Parte iii, 'I Frutti,' pp. 69 ff.). An amended text, based on the collation of several MSS., was printed by Biscioni at Florence in 1723 in his *Prose di Dante Alighieri e di Messer Gio. Boccacci* (pp. 211—15); and yet another text, from a Riccardi MS., was printed by Ignazio Moutier at Florence in 1823, in Vol. VIII (pp. lxv—lxxi) of his edition of *La Cronica di Giovanni Villani.* Biscioni's text was reprinted by Witte, with variants from two other MSS., in his edition of Dante's letters issued at Padua in 1827.

The Latin text of the letter, the existence of which was recorded in the seventeenth century by Lorenzo Pignoria of Padua (1571—1631)[1], was first printed at Padua in 1827 by Witte, from the Venetian MS.[2], in a privately printed volume[3] entitled *Dantis Allighieri Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* VI, pp. 30—46). Witte's Latin text was reprinted, with a few emendations, by Fraticelli, together with an Italian version of his own, at Florence in 1840, in *Dantis Alighierii Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* III, pp. 230—49). In 1842 Torri printed the Latin text at Leghorn from the Vatican MS., which had been discovered some four years before[4], in his *Epistole di Dante Allighieri edite e inedite* (*Epist.* VII, pp. 52—60). In 1857 Fraticelli published a revised edition of the Latin text (*Opere minori di Dante*, ed. 1893, Vol. III, *Epist.* VII, pp. 464—74), based on a fresh collation of the MSS. by Witte[5]. A reprint of Fraticelli's revised text, with some emendations of his own[6], was published by Giuliani at Florence in 1882, in the second volume of his *Opere Latine di Dante* (*Epist.* VII, pp. 22—6). Finally, Fraticelli's text was once more reprinted in 1894 in the Oxford Dante (*Epist.* VII), of which a second edition, revised, was issued in 1897, and a third, more extensively revised, in 1904.

The foregoing editions are represented in the *apparatus criticus* as follows:

[1] In his notes to the *De Rebus Gestis Henrici VII* of Albertino Mussato Pignoria mentions that he had in his own possession a copy of the letter in Latin: 'Dantes vatum clarissimus hisce diebus epistolam scripsit Henrico, quam nacti in pervetusto codice nostro manuscripto publici juris facere decrevimus, et describi curavimus seorsum in calce spicilegii nostri, cum aliis nonnullis ejusdem aevi monumentis; et ejusdem epistolae meminit Jo. Villanus, lib. 9, cap. 35. Quam etiam Italicè redditam vidimus et editam Florentiae, anno 1547' (see Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, x, 385).

[2] See above, p. 4, n. 7.

[3] 'In nur 60 verschenkten Exemplaren,' wrote Witte in his article *Neu aufgefundene Briefe des Dante Allighieri* (see above, p. 1, n. 1). This volume is now exceedingly rare.

[4] See above, pp. 2—3.

[5] See above, p. 3, n. 3.

[6] Giuliani's emendations, for the most part wholly regardless of palaeographical considerations, are as often as not introduced into the text *sub silentio*.

For the Latin text, W. = Witte (1827); F¹. = Fraticelli (1840); T. = Torri (1842); F². = Fraticelli (1857); G. = Giuliani (1882); O¹. = Oxford Dante (1894); O². = do. (1897); O³. = do. (1904); O. = do. (all three editions); W.—O. = W.F¹.T.F².G.O.; Cod. Ven. indicates the readings of the Venetian MS.; for the Italian text, D. = Doni (1547); B. = Biscioni (1723); M. = Moutier (1823).

The first letter in the MS. (*Epist.* VII) begins at the top of fol. 56ro. The title, according to Zenatti[1], is written in the hand of Francesco da Montepulciano, the owner of the MS.[2]

Epistola Dantis Alegerii florentini ad
Henricum Cesarem Augustum[3].

[§ 1.] Immensa dei dilectione testante relicta est nobis[4] pacis hereditas ut in (2) sua mira dulcedine militie nostre dura mitescerent et in usu eius (3) patrie trihumphantis[5] gaudia mereremur. At liuor antiqui et (4) implacabilis hostis humane prosperitati semper et latanter[6] insidians non nul-(5)-los exheredando uolentes ob tutoris absentiam non[7] alios impios[8] (6) denudauit inuitos. hinc diu super[9] flumina confusionis defleuimus (7) et patrocinia iusti Regis incensanter[10] implorabamus[11] qui satellitium (8) seui tiranj disperderet *et* nos *in* nostra Iustitia reformaret. Cumque (9) tu Cesaris et Augusti successor apenninj iuga transiliens uener-(10)-anda signa tarpeia[12] retulisti protinus longa substiterunt suspiria la-(11)-crimarum que diluuia[13] desierunt.

[1] *Dante in Firenze*, p. 378. [2] See above, p. 1.

[3] In Cod. Ven. the letter is headed: *Sanctissimo Triumphatori & domino singulari, domino Henrico, divina providentia Romanorum rege, semper augusto devotissimi sui Dantes Aldigherij florentinus & exul immeritus, ac universaliter omnes Thusci, qui pacem desiderant terre, obsculum ante pedes.* Witte prints *Regi* for (the incorrect) *rege*; *Alligherius* for *Aldigherij*; *Tusci* for *Thusci*; and *osculantur pedes* for *osculum ante pedes.* In the Italian version (as printed by Doni) the letter is headed: *Pistola di Dante Alighieri Poeta Fiorentino all' Imperator' Arrigo di Luzimborgo. Al gloriosissimo et felicissimo triomphatore et singolar Signore Messer' Arrigo, per la divina providenza Re de Romani et sempre accrescitore*, i suoi devotissimi, Dante Alighieri Fiorentino, et non meritevolmente sbandito, et tutti i Toscani universalmente, che pace desiderano, mandano baci alla terra dinanzi a vostri piedi.*

[4] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *nobis est.* [5] Cod. Ven. *triumphis.*

[6] W.—O. *latenter*; Cod. Ven. *conlatenter.* [7] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *nos.*

[8] Cod. Ven. W.F¹. *impie*; T.F².G.O. *impius*; D.B.M. *crudelmente.*

[9] Cod. Ven. *semper.* [10] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *incessanter.*

[11] W.F¹. *imploravimus*; Cod. Ven. *imploravimus et*; T.F².G.O. *implorabanus.*

[12] Cod. Ven. *turpia.* [13] Cod. Ven. *diluuię.*

* The medieval derivation of *Augustus* was from *augeo*, hence the translation of the title as *accrescitore*. The same rendering of *Augustus* occurs in the Italian translation of *Epist.* v (§ 3). Uguccione da Pisa, in his *Magnae Derivationes*, says: 'Ab *augeo*, *augustus*, quilibet romanus imperator, ab augendo imperium.'

Et ceu[1] titan *pre*optatus[2] exori*en*s (12) noua spes latio *secu*lj melioris effulsit. Tunc plerique uota sua (13) *pre*uenientes in iubilo tam saturnia regna q*uam* uirgine*m* redeunte*m* (14) cu*m* Marone cantaba*n*t.

[§ 2.] Ver*um* q*uia* sol *noster* siue desiderij feruor (15) hoc sum-moueat[3] siue faties ueritatis aut morari ia*m*[4] creditur[5] (16) aut retrocedere supputatu*r*[6], q*uas*i Iosue denuo u*e*l Amos fili*us* *im*pera-(17)-ret *in* certitudine[7] dubitare *com*pellimu*r* *et* in uoce*m* *pre*cursoris *irrumpere*[8] (18) sic tu es qui ue*n*turus es an alium expectamus? Et q*uam*uis lo*n*ga (19) sitis *in* dubium que sunt[9] certa *pro*pter esse *pro*-pinqua ut assolet fu-(20)-ribunda deflectat nichilomin*us* *in* te credim*us* et speramus asse-(21)-uerantes te ministrum[10] et eccl*es*ie filium et romane glorie p*ro*moto-(22)-rem. Nam et[11] ego qui scribo ta*m* *pro* me qua*m* *pro* alijs uelut[12] decet (23) Imp*er*atoriam maiestatem benignis-simum uidi et clementissimum te (24) audiuj cum pedes tuos manus mee tractarunt *et* labia mea debi-(25)-tum p*er*soluerunt tunc[13] exultauit *in* me[14] sp*iritus* meus cu*m*[15] tacitus di-(26)-xi mecum ecce Agnus dej ecce qui tollit[16] pecata mundi.

[§ 3.] *Sed* q*uid*[17] tam (27) sera moretur segnities admiramur q*uando*[18] ia*m* dudum *in* Valle uictor (28) heridanj no*n* secus[19] tusci*am* derelinquis[20] p*re*termittis *et* negligis (29) q*uam* si[21] iura tutanda[22] Imp*er*ij circumscribi ligurum[23] finibus arbitreris no*n* (30) p*ro*rsus ut suspicamur adu*er*tens q*uoni*am romanorum gloriosa pote*s*tas[24] (31) nec metis italie nec tricornis[25]

[1] W.F[1]. *quasi*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *ceu*.
[2] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *praecipitatus*; T.F[2].O. *peroptatus*; G. *praeoptatus*; D.B.M. *molto desiderato*.
[3] W.—O. *submoneat*; Cod. Ven. *submoueat*; D.B. *ammonisca*; M. *monisca*.
[4] W.F[1]. *morari te jam*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *morari jam*.
[5] W.F[1]. *credunt*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *creditur*.
[6] W.F[1]. *supputant*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].O. *supputatur*; G. *suspicatur*; D.B.M. *pensasi*.
[7] Cod. Ven. W.F[1].F[2].G.O. *imperaret incertitudine*; T. *imperaret in certitudine*; D.B.M. *nella certitudine*.
[8] W.F[1]. *erumpere*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *irrumpere*.
[9] F[1]. *erant*; B.M. *erano*; D. *sono*; Cod. Ven. *sunt*; W. prefers *erant*, but adheres to the MS. reading in his text.
[10] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *te Dei ministrum*; D.B.M. *te essere ministro di Dio*.
[11] T. omits *Nam*.
[12] W. *ut*; F[1]. *veluti*; Cod. Ven. *uel*; T.F[2].G.O. *velut*.
[13] Cod. Ven. *cum*; W.F[1]. *quum*; D.B.M. *quando*; T.F[2].G.O. *tunc*.
[14] F[1].F[2].G.O. *in te*; Cod. Ven. W.T. *in me*; D.B.M. *in me*.
[15] T.F[2].G.O. *et*; Cod. Ven. *cum*; W.F[1]. *quum*; D.M. *quando*; B. omits.
[16] T.F[2].O. *abstulit*; Cod. Ven. W.F[1].G.D.M. *tollit*; B. omits.
[17] F[1]. *quia*; T. *quae*; Cod. Ven. W.F[2].G.O. *quid*.
[18] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *quando*; D.B.M. *quando*; T.F[2].G.O. *quoniam*.
[19] W.F[1]. omit *non secus*, which are in Cod. Ven.; D.B.M. *non lungi*.
[20] W.F[1]. *derelinquens*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *derelinquis*.
[21] W.F[1]. *quasi*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *quam si*.
[22] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *tuendi*; T.F[2].G.O. *tutanda*.
[23] W.F[1]. *Liguriae*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *Ligurum*.
[24] W.—O. *Romanorum potestas*; Cod. Ven. *R. gloriosa p.*; D.B.M. *la gloriosa signoria de' Romani*.
[25] Cod. Ven. *iriconis*.

europe margine coartatur[1]. (32) nam *et*si ui*m* passa non Augustu*m*[2] gubernacula sua co*n*traxe*r*it[3] un-(33)-diq*ue* ta*m*en de i*n*uiolabilj iure fluctus amphitritis[4] attigens[5] uix (34) ab i*n*utilj unda occeanj se circu*m*cingi dignatur. scriptu*m* eteni*m* (35) uobis est nascetur[6] pulcra troianus origine cesar Imperiu*m* (36) occeano fama*m* qui terminet astris. Et cu*m* uniuersaliter (37) orbem describi edixisset. Augustus ut bos no*s*ter euua*n*ge-(38)-lizans accensus ignis eternj flama[7] remugit si no*n* de iu-(39)-stissimj principatus aula prodiisset[8] edictu*m* unigenitus dej filius (40) homo factus[9] ad profitendu*m*[10] secundu*m* natura*m* assu*m*ptam edicto[11] se subditu*m* (41) nequaqu*am*[12] tu*n*c nasci de uirgine uoluisset. No*n* e*n*im suasisset i*n*iustu*m* (42) que*m* omne*m* iustitia*m* i*m*plere decebat[13].

[§ 4.] Pudeat itaq*ue* in angu-(43)-stissima[14] mu*n*di area irretirj[15] ta*m* diu q*uem* mundus omnis expectat [fol. 56vo] et ab Augusti[16] circu*m*spectione no*n* defluat q*uod* Tuscana tira*n*nis i*n* dilatio*n*is (2) fidutia confortatur et[17] cotidie malign*an*tiu*m* cohortando[18] super*b*ia*m* uir-(3)-es nouas accumulat temeritate*m* temeritati adijciens. Intonet ite-(4)-ru*m*[19] uox illa Curionis i*n* Cesare*m* du*m* trepida*n*t nullo firmate[20] ro-(5)-bore pa*r*tes tolle moras semper[21] nocuit differe paratis. par labor atque (6) metus[22] pretio maiore petu*n*tur. Intonet illa uox i*n*crepitantis a nubis (7) iteru*m* in Eneam[23]. Si te nulla mouet tantaru*m* gloria reru*m*. nec super (8) ipse tua molitis[24] laude laborem. Ascaniu*m* surgentem

[1] Cod. Ven. *cohartatur*. W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *cohartant* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[2] W.F^1.F^2.G.O. *passa in angustum*; Cod. Ven. *p. in Augustum*; T. *p. non Augustum*.

[3] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *contraxit*; T.F^2.G.O. *contraxerit*; D. *contrahera*; M. *contraera*; B. *contradia*.

[4] W.F^1. *Amphitrites*; T.F^2.G. *Amphitritis*; Cod. Ven. *Amphitricis*; D.M. *del Mare Amphitrito il quale è in Grecia* (!).

[5] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *attingens*.

[6] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *Scriptum est enim n.*; T.F^2.G.O. *Scriptum etenim nobis est n.*

[7] Cod. Ven. W.F^1.T. *a. ignis flamma*; F^2.G.O. *a. ignis aeterni f.*; D.B.M. *la fiamma dello eterno fuoco*.

[8] D.B.M. *avesse aperto*, which, as W. observes, looks as if the translator had had *prodidisset* in his Latin original.

[9] Cod. Ven. *homo factus qui*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *qui homo factus* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[10] Cod. Ven. *proficendum:*

[11] Cod. Ven. *edicit*.

[12] W.F^1. *nequaquam tum*; Cod. Ven. *nequaquam tunc*; T.F^2.G.O. *nunquam tunc*; D.B.M. *non...allora*.

[13] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *qui o. j. i. debebat*; T.F^2.G.O. *quem o. j. i. decebat*.

[14] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *angusta*; T.F^2.G.O. *angustissima*; D.B.M. *strettissima*.

[15] Cod. Ven. *metiri*.

[16] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *Augusta*; T.F^2.G.O. *Augusti*.

[17] Cod. Ven. *ut*.

[18] Cod. Ven. *cohartando*.

[19] Cod. Ven. W.F^1. *igitur*; T.F^2.G.O. *iterum*; D. *dunque*; B. *dunque ancora*; M. *adunque*.

[20] Cod. Ven. *firmari*.

[21] Cod. Ven. *nocuit semper*.

[22] Cod. Ven. *metas*.

[23] W.F^1. *a nubibus Aeneam*; Cod. Ven. *Annubis in Eneam*; T.G. *Anubis iterum in Aeneam*; F^2.O. *a nubibus iterum in Aeneam*; D.B.M. *quella voce discesa da cielo....*

[24] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *moliris*.

et spes heredis Iulj. (9) Respice cuj regimen[1] ytalie romanaq*ue* regna[2] debent*ur*.

[§ 5.] Iohannes nam*que* (10) regius pr*i*mogenitus tuus *et* rex quem post diei orientis occasum (11) mundi successiua posteritas prestolatur[3] nobis est alter Ascanius (12) qui uestigia magnj genitoris obseruans in turnos ubiq*ue* sicut leo (13) deseuiet et in latinos[4] uelut agnos[5] mitescet. Precaueant sa-(14)-cratissimj Regis alta consilia ne celeste iuditium samuelis illa uerba (15) reasperet[6] nonne cum paruulus esset in occulis[7] tuis caput in tribubus[8] israel (16) factus es? unxit que te dominus in Regem super israel et[9] misit te deus in (17) uia[10] *et* ait uade *et* interfice peccatores amalech? Nam *et* tu in (18) Regem sacratus es ut amalech percuciens ut[11] agag non parcas[12] at-(19)-que ulciscaris illum qui misit te de gente[13] brutalj *et* de festina[14] (20) sua solennitate que quidem *et* amalech *et* agag sonare[15] dicuntur[16].

[§ 6.] (21) Tu Mediolanj tam uernando quam hiemando moraris et ydram pe-(22)-stiferam per capitum amputationem reris extinguere quia si[17] ma-(23)-gnalia gloriosi alcide[18] recensuisses te ut illum falli cognosceres cui (24) pestilens animal capite repullulante[19] multiplici per dannum[20] cresce-(25)-bat donec instanter magnanimus[21] uite principium

[1] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *regnum*. [2] F².G.O.D.B.M. *tellus*; Cod. Ven. W.F¹. *regna*.
[3] Cod. Ven. *prosteritas prestoletur*. [4] Cod. Ven. *latino*.
[5] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *agnus*; D.B.M. *siccome agnello*.
[6] G. *reasperent*; Cod. Ven. W.F¹.T.F².O. *reasperet*.
[7] W.F¹.T. *esses oculis*; Cod. Ven. F².G.O. *esses in oculis*.
[8] Cod. Ven. *tribus*.
[9] W.F¹. *unxitque Dominus in regem et*; Cod. Ven. *unxitque deus in regem et*; T. *unxitque te Dominus in regem et*; F².G.O. *unxitque te Dominus in regem super Israel et*; D. *et il Signore unse il re et*; B. *e te il Signore unse in Re*; M. *e il Signore unse te re*.
[10] Cod. Ven. *viam*. [11] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *percutias et*.
[12] Cod. Ven. W.F¹. *Agagi parcas minime*; T.F².G.O. *Agag non parcas*; D.B.M. *non perdoni*.
[13] Cod. Ven. *de gente in gentem*.
[14] T. *festiva*; Cod. Ven. W.F¹.F².G.O. *festina*; D.B.M. *affrettata*.
[15] Cod. Ven. *Agagi sonare*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *sanare* as the reading of Cod. Ven.; B. *Agagi...sanarsi*.
[16] W.F¹. omit *que quidem...dicuntur*; B. *le quali cittadi Amalec et Agagi dicono sanarsi*; D.M. omit. W., who misread the reading of his MS., omitted this sentence apparently as being a gloss and unintelligible; but it is essential as an interpretation of Dante's use of the phrases 'de gente brutali et de festina sua sollemnitate' in the previous sentence, where he plays upon the meaning of the names Amalech and Agag. In the *Explanatio nominum*, which accompanies many MSS. of the Vulgate of Cent. XIII and Cent. XIV, Amalech, as Mr Wicksteed has kindly informed me, is explained as 'gens bruta' or 'gens brutalis,' and Agag as 'festina (*var.* festiva) solempnitas.'
[17] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *quod si*.
[18] W.F¹. *m. gloriosa Alcides*; Cod. Ven. *m. gloriose Alcidę*; D.B.M. *le magnifiche cose fatte gloriosamente da Alcide*; T.F².G.O. *m. gloriosi Alcidae*.
[19] W.F¹. *repullulans*; Cod. Ven. *repupulare*; T.F².G.O. *repullulante*.
[20] T.F².G.O. *in damnum*; Cod. Ven. W.F¹. *per damnum*; D.B.M. *per danno*.
[21] W.F¹. *donec magnanimus*; Cod. Ven. T.F².G.O. *donec instanter m.*; D. *attanto che... constantemente*; B.M. *a tanto che...instantemente*.

impetiuit[1] non et-(26)-enim[2] ad arbores extirpandas ualet ipsa ramorum[3] incisio quin[4] iterum[5] (27) multiplicius uirulenter[6] ramificent[7] quousque radices incolumes fue-(28)-rint ut prebeant alimentum quid preses unice mundj peregisse[8] preconi-(29)-cis[9] cum cervicem cremone deflexeris contumacis? nonne tunc[10] uel[11] Bri-(30)-sie uel Papie rabies inopina[12] turgescet immo. que cum *etiam*[13] flagella-(31)-ta[14] resederit mox alia uercellis uel pergamj uel alibj returgebit do-(32)-nec huius scatascentie causa radicalis[15] tollatur *et*[16] radice tanti erroris (33) auulsa cum trunco ramj pungitiuj[17] arescant.

[§ 7.] An ignoras[18] excellen-(34)-tissiue[19] principum nec de specula summe celsitudinis deprehendis ubj (35) vulpecula fetoris istius uenantium secura decumbat[20]? Quippe nec (36) pado precipiti nec tiberj tuo criminosa potatur[21]. verum Sarnj fluenta (37) torrentis adhuc rictus eius[22] infitiunt *et* florentia[23] forte nescis dira (38) hec pernities nuncupatur. Hec est uipera uersa in uiscera genitricis. (39) Hec est[24] languida pecus gregem dominj suj sua contagione commaculans[25]. [fol. 57ro] Hec mirra scelestis[26] *et* impia in Cinare patris amplexus exestuans[27] (2) hec amata illa impatiens que repulso fatalj connubio

[1] W.F[1]. *amputavit*; Cod. Ven. *impetivit*; T.F[2].G.O. *impedivit*; D.B.M. *taglio*; W. erroneously in his *apparatus criticus* gives *impertivit* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[2] Cod. Ven. W.F[1].T. *enim*; F[2].G.O. *etenim*.

[3] Cod. Ven. *Romanorum*.

[4] W.F[1]. *quia*; T. *qui*; Cod. Ven. F[2].G.O. *quin*.

[5] G. *immo*; Cod. Ven. W.F[1].T.F[2].O. *iterum*; D.B.M. *ancora*.

[6] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *via terrae*; D.B.M. *essendo verdi*; T.F[2].G.O. *virulenter*.

[7] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *ramescent*; T.F[2].O. *ramificent*; G. *ramificant*.

[8] W.F[1]. *Qui praees unice mundo quid peregisse*; Cod. Ven. *Qui praees unice mundi peregisse*; T.F[2].G.O. *quid praeses unice mundi p.*; in a note W. proposes a conjectural emendation (as an alternative to that adopted in his text), which is the reading of our MS.

[9] W.F[1]. *praeconiaberis*; Cod. Ven. *praeconiis*; T.G. *praeconjicis*; F[2].O. *praeconizabis*; D *che te...chiameranno*; B. *che...annunzierai tu aver fatto*; M. *che...annunzierai tu che avrai fatto*.

[10] Cod. Ven. *nonne ut tuo*.

[11] Cod. Ven. *uel tu*.

[12] In the MS. between *rabies* and *inopina* is *u* cancelled.

[13] W.F[1]. *quum*; Cod. Ven. *cum etiam*; T.F[2].G.O. *quum etiam*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *quum et* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[14] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *flagellum*; T.F[2].G.O. *flagellata*; D.B.M. *flagellata*.

[15] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *donec hujusmodi rabies*; D.B.M. *la radicevole* (B. *radichevole*; M. *radicale*) *cagione di questo pizzicore*; T.F[2].G.O. *donec hujus scatescentiae causa radicalis*.

[16] W. conjecturally inserts *et*, which is omitted by Cod. Ven.

[17] W.F[1]. *pungentes*; Cod. Ven. *pugitivi*; D.B.M. *pungenti*; T.F[2].G.O. *pungitivi*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *pugitiens* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[18] D.B.M. *Signore*, which, as W. observes, points to a barbarous *Signor es* in the original.

[19] *Sic.* for *excellentissime*.

[20] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *recumbat*; T.F[2].G.O. *decumbat*.

[21] W.F[1].T. *potat*; Cod. Ven. *potant*; F[2].G.O. *potatur*.

[22] W.F[1]. *vitia sua*; D.B.M. *li suoi inganni*; Cod. Ven. T.F[2].G.O. *rictus ejus*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *victus es* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[23] Cod. Ven. *Florentiam*.

[24] Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. omit *est*.

[25] Cod. Ven. W.F[1].T. *pecus quae g. d. s. s. c. commaculat*; F[2].G.O. *pecus g. d. s. s. c. commaculans*.

[26] T.F[2].G.O. *scelesta*; Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *scelestis*.

[27] Cod. Ven. *in Cinere posita a. e.*; D.B.M. *la quale s' infiamma nel fuoco degli abbraciamenti del padre*.

quem fata[1] ne-(3)-gabant generum[2] sibi ascire non timuit sed in bella furialiter prouo-(4)-cauit[3] et demum male ausa luendo laqueo se suspendit. Ve-(5)-re matrem uiperea feritate dilaniare contendit[4] dum contra Romam (6) cornua rebellionis exacuit que ad imaginem suam atque simi-(7)-litudinem fecit illam. Vere fumos[5] euaporante[6] sanie ui-(8)-tiantes exalat et inde uicine[7] pecudes et inscie[8] contabescunt (9) dum falsis illiciendo[9] blanditijs et figimentis[10] agregat sibi fini-(10)-timos et infatuat[11] agregatos. Vere in paternos ardet ipsa (11) concubitus[12] dum improba procacitate conatur summj pontificis[13] qui (12) pater est patrum adversum[14] te uiolare ascensum[15]. Vere dej (13) ordinationi resistit[16] proprie uoluntatis[17] ydolum uenerando dum re-(14)-gem aspernata ligitimum[18] non erubescit insana regi non suo (15) iura non sua pro male agenda[19] potestate pacisci. sed atendat[20] (16) ad laqueum mulier furiata quo se innectit[21]. Nam sepe quis in re-(17)-probum sensum traditur ut traditus fatiat ea que non conueniunt[22] (18) que quamuis iusta[23] sint opera iusta tamen supplicia esse noscuntur.

[§ 8.] (19) Eya itaque rumpe moras proles altera[24] ysai summe[25] tibi fiduti-(20)-am de occulis dominj dej[26] Sabaoth coram quo agis et Goliam hunc (21) in funda sapientie tue[27] atque in lapide uirium tuarum

[1] W.F[1]. *quem sortes*; Cod. Ven. *quem semper*; T.F[2].G.O. *quem fata*.

[2] So Cod. Ven., the reading of which W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives as *generem*.

[3] W.F[1]. *sed furialiter in bellum vocavit*; Cod. Ven. T. *sed f. in bella vocavit*; F[2].G.O. *sed in bella f. provocavit*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives the reading of Cod. Ven. as *in bello*.

[4] There is a hiatus in Cod. Ven. between *ausa* and *dum contra*; W.F[1]. insert conjecturally (from the Italian) *debitumque solvens, laqueo se suspendit. Vere viperina feritate matrem lacerare ausa*; T. *luendo laqueo se suspendit. Verè viperina feritate matrem laniare contendit*; F[2].G.O. *l. l. s. s. V. matrem viperea feritate dilaniare c.*; D.B.M. *pagando il debito con un laccio s' impiccò. Veramente con ferità di vipera si sforza di squarciar la madre*.

[5] Cod. Ven. *fumo*.

[6] Cod. Ven. *euaporantes*; in MS. between *fumos* and *euaporante* is *es* cancelled.

[7] W.F[1]. *viciniae*; Cod. Ven. *uicinie*; D.B.M. *vicine*; T.F[2].G.O. *vicinae*.

[8] W.F[1]. *exterae*; Cod. Ven. *uiscie*; D. *simplici*; B.M. *strane*; T.F[2].G.O. *insciae*.

[9] W.—O. *alliciendo*; Cod. Ven. *aliciendo*.

[10] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *figmentis*.

[11] W.F[1]. *insanescit*; Cod. Ven. *insinuat*; T.F[2].G.O. *infatuat*; D.B.M. *fa impazzare*.

[12] W.F[1]. *paternos incensa concubitus*; Cod. Ven. *p. ipsa c.*; T.F[2].G.O. *p. ardet ipsa c.*

[13] Cod. Ven. *summum pontificem*.

[14] W.—O. *adversus*; Cod. Ven. *aduersum*.

[15] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *assensum*.

[16] Cod. Ven. *restitit*.

[17] Cod. Ven. *voluntati*.

[18] W.—O. *legitimum*.

[19] W.F[1]. *agendi*; Cod. Ven. *agende*; T.F[2].G.O. *agenda*.

[20] W.F[1].F[2].O. *attendit*; Cod. Ven. *accendit*; T.G. *attendat*; D.B.M. *attende*.

[21] T.F[2].G.O. *innectat*; Cod. Ven. W.F[1]. *innectit*; D.B.M. *si lega*.

[22] Cod. Ven. *etiam conveniunt*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *conuenienti* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[23] Cod. Ven. W.—O. *injusta*; D.B.M. *ingiuste*.

[24] Cod. Ven. W.F[1].T.F[2].O[1].O[2]. *alta*; D.B.M. *alta*; G.O[3]. *altera*.

[25] See note on *Epist.* VI, fol. 58[ro], l. 26.

[26] F[1]. omits *dei*.

[27] Cod. Ven. *sue*; B.M. *tua*; D. omits.

prosterne quoniam (22) in eius occasu nox[1] et umbra timoris castra filistinorum[2] operiet (23) fugient filistej *et* liberabitur israel. tunc hereditas nostra quam sine (24) intermisione deflemus ablatam nobis erit in integrum restituta. (25) At quem admodum[3] sacrosancte Ierusalem memores exules in babillone (26) gemiscimus ita tunc ciues *et* respirantes in pace[4] confusionis mi-(27)-serias[5] in gaudio recolemus[6].

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. VII.

Title. *For* Alighierius, *read* Alagherii[7].
For osculantur pedes, *read* (*with Cod. Ven.*) osculum ante pedes[8].
l. 19. *For* peroptatus, *read* (*with MS.*) praeoptatus.
l. 44. *For* in te...et tacitus, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) in me... quum tacitus.
l. 46. *For* abstulit, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) tollit[9].
l. 48. *For* quoniam, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) quando.
l. 54. *For* Romanorum potestas, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) Romanorum gloriosa potestas[10].

[1] Cod. Ven. *nos*; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives *mos* as the reading of Cod. Ven.

[2] W.F[1]. *Filisteorum*; Cod. Ven. *phylistinorum*; T.F[2].G.O. *Filistinorum*; D.B.M. *Filistei*.

[3] W.F[1]. *At quidem, ad modum quo nunc* (the last two words are not in Cod. Ven., but were inserted conjecturally by W.); T.F[2].G.O. *Ac quemadmodum*.

[4] So Cod. Ven.; W. in his *apparatus criticus* erroneously gives the reading of Cod. Ven. as *pacem*.

[5] Cod. Ven. *miserius*.

[6] W.F[1]. *revolvemus*; Cod. Ven. *reuelemur*; D.B.M. *rivolgeremo*; T.F[2].G.O. *recolemus*.— In Cod. Ven. the letter is dated:—*Scriptum in Tuscia sub fonte Sarni XV Kalendas Maias, divi Henrici faustissimi cursus ad Italiam anno primo.* W. prints *fontem* for *fonte*; and *XI* for *XV*. F[1].T.F[2].G.O. give the date as *XIV Kal. Maias MCCCXI*. In D.B.M. it is as follows: *Scritto in Toscana sotto la fonte d' Arno a di XVI del Mese d' Aprile MCCCXI, nell' Anno primo del coronamento d' Italia dello Splendidissimo et honoratissimo Arrigo.* (For the meaningless *coronamento d' Italia* W. reads after a Roman MS. *corrimento ad Italia*; the same MS. instead of *splendidissimo et onoratissimo Arrigo*, reads *divino e felicissimo Arrigo*.)

[7] The title of the letter is not in the MS.; it is supplied from the Venetian MS. by Witte, Torri and others. *Dantes Alagherii* is the recognized Latinized form of Dante's name (cf. *Epist.* VI tit. and *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, proem.).

[8] 'Osculum ante pedes' ('mittit' or 'dat'), was one of the common formulae used in addressing personages of exalted rank; cf. the similar 'officium ante pedes' in the title of the second letter addressed by the Countess of Battifolle to the Empress (see below, p. 20).

[9] *Tollit* is also the word in the Vulgate (*John* I, 29). It is difficult to account for the substitution of *abstulit* by the editors; possibly it was induced by a recollection of *Rom.* XI, 27: 'cum abstulero peccata eorum.'

[10] Dante several times elsewhere uses the epithet *gloriosus* of Rome and Romans; cf. *Mon.* II, 11, l. 65: 'gloriosum populum Romanum' (also, II, 2, l. 70; 5, l. 37); *Conv.* IV, 5, l. 52: 'gloriosa Roma'; *Conv.* IV, 6, l. 95: 'glorioso Catone': *Conv.* IV, 6, l. 113: 'glorioso Torquato'; cf. also *Purg.* X, 73: 'l' alta gloria del Roman principato'; and *Mon.* II, 3, l. 30: 'gloriosum regem Aeneam' (Aeneas being regarded by Dante as the founder of the Roman Empire).

l. 71. *For* nunquam, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) nequaquam[1].
l. 86. *For* a nubibus, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) Anubis[2].
l. 119. *For* in damnum, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) per damnum[3].
l. 121. *For* impedivit, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) impetivit.
l. 126. *For* praeconizabis, *read* (*with MS.*) praeconicis[4] (praeconjicis).
l. 146. *For* scelesta, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) scelestis[5].
l. 171. *For* innectat, *read* (*with MS. and Cod. Ven.*) innectit.
Colophon. *For* sub fontem, *read* (*with Cod. Ven.*) sub fonte.
Omit MCCCXI (*which is not in Cod. Ven.*).

§ III.

Epistola VI (To the Florentines).

This letter, like the preceding, is one of those mentioned by Villani[6]. It was evidently known to Leonardo Bruni (1369–1444), who in his *Vita di Dante* says that when the Emperor Henry VII came into Italy Dante, 'levatosi coll' animo altiero, cominciò a dir male di quelli che reggevano la terra[7], appellandoli scellerati e cattivi, e minacciando loro la debita vendetta per la potenza dell' imperadore, contro la quale diceva esser manifesto ch' essi non avrebbon potuto avere scampo

[1] Cf. *De Monarchia*, II, 12, ll. 41—6: 'Christus, ut scriba ejus Lucas testatur, sub edicto Romanae auctoritatis nasci voluit de Virgine Matre, ut in illa singulari generis humani descriptione Filius Dei, homo factus, homo conscriberetur.'

[2] The substitution by W. and others of *a nubibus* for the MS. reading *Anubis* cannot be justified. *A nubibus* does not fit the facts of the case, for the message of Mercury to Aeneas was not delivered 'from the clouds,' but after Mercury had alighted amid the 'magalia' of Carthage (see *Aen.* IV, 259 ff.). Further, if *a nubibus* was the original reading it is difficult to conceive a scribe substituting the unfamiliar *Anubis*, which is found in both MSS.; the former is manifestly a 'facilior lectio.' The identification of Anubis with Mercury was well-known in the Middle Ages. It is mentioned by Servius in his commentary on *Aen.* VIII, 698, and hence no doubt found its way into the *Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum* of Papias, the *Magnae Derivationes* of Uguccione da Pisa, and the *Catholicon* of Giovanni da Genova. Uguccione, with whose work, as I have shown elsewhere (see *Dante Studies and Researches*, pp. 97 ff.), Dante was familiar, says: '*Nubes* componitur cum *a*, quod est *sine*: et dicitur *hic anubis*, idest mercurius, quasi *sine nube*: est enim deus sermonis quia omnia revelat; et idem dicitur *cinocephalus*, a *cinos* quod est *canis*, et *cephas caput*, quia cum canino capite depingitur apud egypticos propter sagacitatem; est enim canis animal valde sagax; et producit *nu*, sicut nubes; unde Virgilius: Omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator anubis.'

[3] The MS. reading *per damnum* is obviously preferable; the allusion, of course, being to the fact that for every head cut off from the hydra two new ones sprang up in its place.

[4] The *praeconiis* of Cod. Ven. points also to this reading. 'Quid peregisse praeconicis quum, &c.?' 'What do you suppose you will have accomplished when you have crushed Cremona?'

[5] *Scelestis* is a recognised mediaeval form. Papias in his *Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum* (written circ. 1060) says: '*scelestus* et *scelestis* dicitur'; and Giovanni da Genova in his *Catholicon* (completed in 1286) has: '*Scelus, sceleris*...unde *scelestus -sta -stum*...dicitur etiam *hic* et *haec scelestis* et *hoc -ste.*'

[6] See above, p. 4.

[7] That is, Florence.

alcuno[1].' It was also known independently to another early biographer of Dante, Giannozzo Manetti (1396—1459), who in his *Vita Dantis*, in the same connection, writes: 'Dantes quoque se ulterius continere non potuit, quin spe plenus epistolam quamdam ad Florentinos, ut ipse vocat, intrinsecos contumeliosam sane scriberet, in qua eos acerbissime insectatur[2].'

Like *Epistolae* I, II, and III, and the three so-called Battifolle letters, this letter, so far as is known, is preserved in the Vatican MS. alone. Extracts from it, in German, were printed by Witte in 1838 in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*[3]. The Latin text was first printed by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters, and was reprinted, with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli and Giuliani, and in the Oxford Dante[4].

In the *apparatus criticus* T. = Torri; F. = Fraticelli; G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante.

In the MS. there is no break between the end of *Epist.* VII and the beginning of *Epist.* VI, the title of which, commencing in the middle of l. 27 of fol. 57ro, follows on continuously with the text (and colophon) to the middle of l. 28 of fol. 58vo.

Dantes alagh*erii*[5] florentin*us* (28) et exul
im*m*eritus scelestissimis[6] florentinis *intrin*secis[7].

[§ 1.] Et*er*-(29)-nj pia p*ro*uidentia regis q*ui* du*m* celestia sua bonitate p*er*petu-(30)-at *in*fera no*str*a despiciendo no*n* dese*r*it sacrosancto Romanor*um* *im*pe-(31)-rio res hu*m*anas disposuit gubernandas. ut sub tanti se-(32)-renitate[8] p*re*sidij genus mortale quiesce*r*et *et* ubiq*ue* n*atur*a poscen-(33)-te ciuiliter degeretur. Hoc et si diuinis *comprob*atur elogijs[9] (34) hoc *et* si solius podio rationis inixa *con*testatur antiquitas (35) no*n* leuiter t*amen* veritati applaudit *sed*[10] solio

[1] *Vita di Dante*, ed. Brunone Bianchi, 1883, p. xxi. The references to the title of the letter ('scelestissimis Florentinis'), and to the threats of the Emperor's vengeance and to the hopelessness of resistance (§§ 3—5), are unmistakable.

[2] See *Philippi Villani Liber de Civitatis Florentiae Famosis Civibus*, etc., Florence, 1847, pp. 77—8. Here again the reference (independent of that of Bruni) to the title of the letter ('Florentinis intrinsecis') is unmistakable. It has been shown by Zenatti that this very MS. was once in the possession of Manetti (see above, p. 1).

[3] In the article, *Neu aufgefundene Briefe des Dante Allighieri* (see above, p. 1, n. 1).

[4] See above, p. 5.

[5] T.F.G. *Allagherius*; O. *Aligherius*.

[6] Between this and the previous word is *se* cancelled.

[7] T.G. *intrinsecus*; F.O. *intrinsecis*.

[8] G. *securitate*; T.F.O. *serenitate*; G. says: 'potendosi dal codice ritrarre *securitate*, ho prescelto questo vocabolo che parmi più confacevole al proprosito'; but the MS. unmistakably reads *serenitate*.

[9] F.G.O. *eloquiis*; T. *elogiis*.

[10] T.F.G.O. *quod*.

augustalj[1] uacan-(36)-te totus orbis exorbitat quod nauclerus et remiges[2] in na-(37)-uicula petrj dormitant et quod ytalia misera sola priuatis arbi-(37)-trijs derelicta omnibusque[3] publico moderamine destituta quanta [fol. 57vo] ventorum fluentuum ue[4] concussione feratur uerba non caperent[5] sed et uix (2) italie[6] infelices lacrimis metiuntur. Igitur in hanc dej manifesti-(3)-ssimam uoluntatem quicumque temere presumendo tumescunt si (4) gladius eius qui dicit mea est ultio de celo non cecidit ex (5) nunc seueri iudicis aduentante iuditio pallore notentur.

[§ 2.] Vos (6) autem diuina iura et humana transgredientes quos dira cupi-(7)-ditatis ingluuies paratos in omne nefas illexit nonne terror (8) secunde[7] mortis exagitat[8]? Ex quo primi et solj iugum libertatis (9) horrentes in Romanj Principis mundj Regis et dej ministrj glo-(10)-riam fremuistis[9]? atque iure prescriptionis[10] utentes debite (11) subiectionis offitium denegando in rebellionis vesaniam maluistis (12) insurgere[11]. An ignoratis amentes et discolj publica iura cum (13) sola temporis terminatione finirj et nullius prescriptionis[12] calculo (14) fore obnoxias[13]? Nempe legum sanctiones[14] alme[15] declarant et humana (15) ratio percuntando[16] decernit publica rerum dominia quantalibet diutur-(16)-nitate[17] neglecta numquam posse uanescere uel abstenuata conque-(17)-ri[18]. Nam quod ad omnium cedit utilitatem sine omnium detrimento (18) interire non potest uel etiam infirmarj, et hoc deus et natura non uult (19) et mortalium penitus abhorreret ascensus[19] quod[20] fatua[21] talj opinione (20) summota tamquam alteri babillonij pium[22] deserentes Imperium noua regna (21) tentatis ut alia sit florentina ciuilitas alia sit Romana[23] (22) cur apostolocice[24] monarchie similiter inuidere non libet[25] ut si (23) delia geminatur in celo geminetur et delius? Atqui si male (24) ausa rependere uobis

[1] T. *augustale*; F.G.O. *augustali*.
[2] Between this and the previous word is *na* expunctuated.
[3] T.F.G.O. *omnique*.
[4] T.F.G.O. *fluctuumque*.
[5] G. *capiunt*; T.F.O. *caperent*.
[6] T.F.G.O. *Itali*.
[7] T. *sedem*; F.G.O. *secundae*.
[8] T.F.G.O. punctuate with comma instead of note of interrogation after *exagitat*.
[9] T.F.G.O. place semi-colon after *fremuistis*.
[10] T. *proscriptionis*; F.G.O. *praescriptionis*; Witte in his extract (*D.-F.* I, 483) translates by *Verjährung*.
[11] T.F.G.O. place note of interrogation after *insurgere*.
[12] T. *proscriptionis*; F.G.O. *praescriptionis*.
[13] T.F.G.O. *obnoxia*.
[14] T.G. *sanctores*; F.O. *sanctiones*.
[15] T. *aperte*; F.G.O. *altissime*.
[16] G. *perscrutando*; T.F.O. *percunctando*.
[17] MS. *diurturnitate*, the first *r* being expunctuated.
[18] T. *torqueri*; G. *conquidi*; F.O. *conquiri*.
[19] T.F.G.O. *adsensus*.
[20] T.F.G.O. *quid*.
[21] T.G. *fatui*; F.O. *fatua*.
[22] T. *proprium*; F.G.O. *pium*.
[23] T.F.G.O. place note of interrogation after *Romana*.
[24] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *apostolicae*.
[25] T. places note of interrogation, and F.G.O. semicolon, after *libet*.

terrorj non est territet saltin[1] obstinata (25) precordia quod non modo sapientia sed initium eius ad penam culpe uobis (26) ablatum est. Nulla etenim condictio delinquentis formidolosi-(27)-or quam impudenter et sine dei timore quicquid libet agentis. Hac (28) nimirum persepe[2] animaduersione percutitur impius ut moriens obliui-(29)-scatur suj qui dum uiueret oblitus est dej.

[§ 3.] Sin prorsus arrogan-(30)-tia uestra insolens adeo roris altissimj ceu cacumina gelboe (31) uos fecit exortes[3] ut senatus eterni consulto restitisse timori non (32) fuerit nec etiam non timuisse timetis numquid timor ille pernicio-(33)-sus humanus videlicet[4] atque mundanus abesse poterit superbissimj uestrj (34) sanguinis uestreque multum lacrimande rapine ineuitabilj naufra-(35)-gio properante[5]. An septi uallo ridiculo cuiquam defensionj con-(36)-fidetis[6]. o male concordes o mira cupidine cecati quid uallo (37) sepsisse quid propugnaculis et pinnis armasse[7] iuuabit? cum ad-(38)-uolauerit aquila in auro[8] terribilis que nunc pyrenen nunc caucason (39) nunc athlanta superuolans militie celi magis confortata suffla-[fol. 58ro]-mine uasta maria quondam transuolando despexit? quid cum (2) affore stupescetis miserrimj hominum delirantis hesperie domito-(3)-rem? non equidem spes[9] quam frustra sine more fouetis relu-(4)-ctantia ista iuuabitur sed hac abice[10] iusti regis aduentus in-(5)-flamabitur ampius[11] ac indignata misericordia semper concomi-(6)-tans eius exercitum auolabit. Et quo false libertatis trabeam (7) tueri existimatis eo uere seruitutis in ergastula[12] cancidetis[13]. mi-(8)-ro namque dei iuditio quandoque agi credendum est ut unde digna supp-(9)-litia ipius[14] declinare arbitratur unde[15] in ea grauius precipitetur[16] (10) et qui diuine uoluntati reluctatus est et sciens et uolens ei-(11)-dem militet nesciens atque nolens

[§ 4.] uidebitis edifitia uestra (12) non neccessitati prudenter instructa sed delitijs inconsulte mutata (13) que pergama rediuiua non cingunt tam ariete ruere tristes quam (14) igne cremari videbitis plebem circumquaque furentem nunc in contra-(15)-ria pro et contra. Vnde[17] in idem aduersus uos horrenda clamantem (16) quoniam simul[18] Ienuna[19] et timida nescit esse templa quoque spoliata quo-(17)-tidie

[1] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *saltem*.
[2] T. *saepe*; F.G.O. *persaepe*.
[3] T. *expertes*; F.G.O. *exsortes*.
[4] T. *humanusque*; F.G.O. *humanus videlicet*.
[5] T.F.G.O. place note of interrogation after *properante*.
[6] F.G.O. *confiditis*; T. *confidetis*.
[7] T.F.G.O. *vos armasse*.
[8] Boehmer (*Dante-Jahrbuch*, I, 396) proposes *in aura* (!).
[9] T. *spe*; F.G.O. *spes*.
[10] T. *hoc objice*; G. *hoc obice*; F.O. *hac obice*.
[11] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *amplius*.
[12] T. *argastula*; F.G.O. *ergastula*.
[13] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *concidetis*.
[14] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *impius*.
[15] T.F.G.O. *inde*.
[16] T. *praecipitet*; F.G.O. *praecipitetur*.
[17] F.G.O. *deinde*; T. *unde*.
[18] T.F.G.O. *simul et*.
[19] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *jejuna*.

matronar*um* frequ*en*tata *con*cursu[1] p*ar*uulos q*ue*[2] admiran*tes* (18) et *in*scios peccata patru*m* luere destinatos uidere pigebit. (19) Et si p*re*saga mens mea no*n* fallit*ur* sic signis ueridicis sic*ut* (20) *in*expugnabilibus argumen*ti*s *in*structa p*re*nun*ti*ans vrbe*m* diuti-(21)-no[3] merore *con*fectam[4] *in* manu*s* alienor*um* tradi final*iter* plurima ue*stri* p*ar*te (22) seu neci[5] seu captiuitati[6] deper*di*ta[7] perpeirsuri[8] exiliu*m* pauci[9] cu*m* fle-(23)-tu cernetis. Vtq*ue* breuiter colligam quas tulit calamitates (24) illa ciuitas gloriosa *in* fide p*ro* libertate sagun*tum* *in*gnominiose (25) uos eas[10] *in* p*er*fidia p*ro* seruitute subire neccesse est.

[§ 5.] Nec ab *in*opina (26) parmensiu*m* fortuna su*m*matis[11] audatiam q*ui* malesauda fame urg-(27)-ente mur*mur*an*tes* *in*inuicem[12] p*ri*us moriamur *et* *in* media arma (28) ruam*us* *in* castra cesaris absente Cesare p*ro*ruper*unt* nam *et* hij[13] quam*quam* (29) de uictoria uictoriam sint[14] adepti nichilomin*us* ibi sun*t* de dolore (30) dolore*m* memorab*iliter* con*se*cuti. S*ed* recen*se*te fulmina federici p*ri*oris (31) et mediolanu*m* con*su*lite pari*ter* et spoletu*m* q*uoni*am ipsor*um* peruersione simul (32) et eu*er*sione discussa uiscera u*es*tra nimiu*m* dilatata frigescent (33) et cor*da* u*es*tra nimiu*m* feruentia contrahen*tur* ha[15] tuscor*um* uanis-(34)-simj tam n*atur*a q*uam* uitio[16] *in*censati[17]. Quam[18] *in* noctis tenebris malesa-(35)-ne mentis pedes[19] oberren*t* an*te* oculos pennator*um* nec p*er*penditis (36) figuratis[20] ignari. Viden*t* namq*ue* uos pennati *et* *im*maculati *in* uia (37) q*uasi* stantes *in* lumine[21] carceris et mis*er*antem q*uem*piam ne forte uos (38) libe*r*et captiuatos *etiam*[22] *in* com*pe*dibus astrictos et manicis p*ro*pulsan-(39)-tes nec aduertis[23] dominantem

[1] MS. *concocursu*, the medial *co* being expunctuated.
[2] T. *quoque*; F.G.O. *que*.
[3] T.G. *diuturno*; F.O. *diutino*.
[4] T. *affectam*; F.G.O. *confectam*.
[5] T.F.G.O. *nece*.
[6] T.F.G.O. *captivitate*.
[7] T. *disperdita*; F.G.O. *deperdita*.
[8] *Sic*; T.F.O. *perpessuri*; G. *perpessuris*.
[9] G. *paucis*.
[10] T. omits *eas*.
[11] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *sumatis*. *Sumo* was very often written by medieval scribes (as in MS. above, and in *Epist.* VII, fol. 57ro, l. 19) with double *m*; hence the warning in the *Catholicon*: '*Sumo*, *-mis*, *-psi*, *-mere*, *-ptum*...scribitur per unum *m*...sed *summo*, *-as* per duo *m*, unde versus: M. *summare* duplex sibi vult, sed *sumere* simplex.' (See also Rajna's edition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, p. clxxxix.)
[12] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *invicem*.
[13] T.F.G.O. *hi*; but *hii* was a common medieval form (see Rajna's edition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, pp. clxxx—clxxxi).
[14] T.F.G.O. *sunt*.
[15] T.G.O. *Ah*; F. *Ha*.
[16] T. *tam vitio quam natura*; F.G.O. *tam natura quam vitio*.
[17] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *insensati*.
[18] T.F.G.O. *quantum*.
[19] For *pedes*, Novati (*Le Epistole di Dante*, in *Lectura Dantis: Le Opere Minori di Dante*, p. 310) proposes *retes*, thinking that Dante had in mind *Proverbs*, I, 17: 'Frustra jacitur rete ante oculos pennatorum.' But it is difficult to see what sense he would make out of the passage in that case. 'Pedes mentis' may be a somewhat strained metaphor, but an exactly parallel expression occurs in the *De Monarchia* (II, 8, l. 9): 'Quaedam judicia Dei sunt ad quae humana ratio propriis pedibus pertingere potest.'
[20] T.F.G.O. insert *nec* before *figuratis*.
[21] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *limine*.
[22] T.F.G.O. *et*.
[23] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *advertitis*.

cupidine*m* quia cecj estis uenenoso [fol. 58vo] susurrio[1] blandiente*m* minis frustratorijs cohibente*m* nec non cap-(2)-tiuitate*m*[2] uos *in* lege peccati ac sacratissimis legib*us* q*ue* iustitie[3] (3) n*atur*alis imitan*tur* imaginem parere uetante*m*. obse*r*uan*t*ia quar*um* si (4) leta si libera no*n* tan*tum* no*n* se*r*uitus e*sse* p*r*obat*ur* quin imo p*er*spicaciter[4] intu-(5)-enti liquet[5] ut[6] est ipsa su*m*ma libertas. Na*m* quid aliud (6) hec nisi liber cursus uoluntatis *in* actu*m* q*uem* suis leges ma*n*sue-(7)-tis[7] expediu*n*t? itaq*ue* solis existentibus liberis q*ui* uolunta*r*ie (8) legi obediu*n*t quas[8] uos esse censebitis qui du*m* p*r*etenditis li-(9)-bertatis affect*um* co*n*tra leges uniu*er*sas *in* legu*m* p*r*incipe*m* *con*spiratis?

[§ 6.] (10) o mise*r*ima Fesulanor*um* p*r*opago et iter*um* iam pu*n*ita[9] barbaries (11) an par*um* timoris p*r*elibata incutiu*n*t? omni*no* uos trem*er*e arbitror (12) uigilantes q*uam*q*uam* spem simuletis *in* fatie u*er*boq*ue* me*n*daci atq*ue* (13) *in* so*m*pnijs exp*er*gisci plerum*que* siue pauesce*n*tes *in*fusa p*r*esagia siue (14) diurna *con*silia recolentes. V*er*um si me*r*ito trepidantes i*n*sanis-(15)-se penitet no*n* dolentes ut *in* amaritudi*n*em penitentie[10] (16) metus dolorisq*ue* riuolj *con*fluan*t* ue*st*ris a*n*imis *in*figenda super*sunt* *quod* (17) Romane rei baiulus hic diuus *et* trihumphator henricus (18) no*n* sua priuata s*ed* publica mu*n*di co*m*moda sitiens ardua q*uod* no-(19)-bis[11] aggressus est sua[12] sponte penas no*st*ras pa*r*ticipans tamq*uam* ad (20) ipsum post chri*st*um digitum p*r*ophe*t*ye p*r*ophe*t*a direxe*r*it esayas cu*m* (21) spi*r*itu dei reuelante p*r*edixit uere langores no*st*ros ipse tulit et dolo-(22)-res no*st*ros ipse portauit. Igit*ur* te*m*pus amarissime penitendi uos (23) tremere[13] p*re*suptor*um*[14] si dissimulare no*n* uultis ade*sse* *con*spicitis *et*[15] (24) sera penitentia hoc amodo[16] uenie genitiua no*n* erit quin[17] po-(25)-tius te*m*pestiue a*n*imaduersionis exordiu*m* e*st* e*n*im q*uoni*am peccator p*er*cu-(26)-titur ut sine retractati*o*ne riuant*ur*[18].

Scripsit[19] p*r*idie kale*n*das (27) aprileis[20] *in* finib*us* tuscie sub fonte[21] sarni faustissimj cursus hen-(28)-ricj cesaris ad ytalia*m* anno p*r*imo.

[1] T.F.G.O. *susurro*; but *susurrium* was the medieval form.
[2] T.F.G.O. *captivantem*.
[3] After *iustitie*, at the end of the line, is *n*, which has not been cancelled.
[4] T. *perspicater*.
[5] In MS. before *liquet* is *libet*, which has been expunctuated.
[6] G. omits *ut*.
[7] G. *adsuetis*.
[8] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *quos*.
[9] T.F.G.O. *punica*.
[10] After *penitentie*, at the end of the line, is *met*, which has been cancelled.
[11] T. *arduaque pro nobis*; F.G.O. *ardua quaeque pro nobis*; but read *ardua pro nobis*, the scribe having confused the abbreviations of *quod* and *pro*.
[12] T. *suas*.
[13] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *temere*.
[14] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *praesumptorum*.
[15] T. *At*; F.G.O. *Et*.
[16] F.O. *hoc a modo*; T. *hoc amodo*; G. *non modo*.
[17] T. *quia*; F.G.O. *quin*.
[18] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *revertatur*.
[19] F.G.O. *Scriptum*; T. *Scripsit*.
[20] T. *prid. Kal. Apriles*; F.G.O. *prid. Kal. Aprilis*.
[21] F.G.O. *fontem*; T. *fonte*.

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. VI.

Title. *For* Aligherius, *read* (*with MS.*) Alagherii[1].

l. 9. *For* eloquiis, *read* (*with MS.*) elogiis[2].

l. 40. *For* altissime, *read* (*with MS.*) almae[3].

l. 80. *For* vos armasse, *read* (*with MS.*) armasse.

l. 152. *For* susurro, *read* (*with MS.*) susurrio[4].

l. 169. *For* punica, *read* (*with MS.*) punita[5].

l. 183. *For* ardua quaeque pro nobis, *read* ardua pro nobis[6].

l. 196. *For* revertatur, *read* moriatur[7].

Colophon. *For* Aprilis...fontem, *read* (*with MS.*) Apriles[8]...fonte.

§ IV.

Battifolle Letters.

(*Epist.* VIII—X in Torri; *Epist.* I*—III* in Giuliani.)

The three so-called Battifolle[9] letters, addressed by a Countess of Battifolle[10], wife of one of the Conti Giudi, to Margaret of Brabant, wife

[1] See note on title of *Epist.* VII, above.

[2] The substitution of *eloquiis* is quite uncalled for. Papias says: '*Elogium*, titulus cujuslibet rei, proverbium,...eloquium...divinum responsum'; and Giovanni da Genova: '*hoc elogium*, idest proverbium et responsum divinum...et textus carminum...vel deorum mysterium; unde *hic elogius*, versiculus.' Du Cange quotes instances of the use of *elogium* in Cent. XII and XIV in the sense of *testamentum*, in which sense it occurs repeatedly in the Pandects of Justinian. On the other hand the phrase 'divina eloquia' occurs twice (if the printed editions are to be trusted) in the *De Monarchia* (III, 4, l. 88; 10, l. 13; cf. also II, 9, l. 101).

[3] Papias: '*Almus*, sanctus, pulcher, excelsus'; Giovanni da Genova: '*Almus*, idest sanctus, pulcer, nutriens, secundum Rabanum'; the Emperor Louis the Pious is described in an old chronicle quoted by Du Cange as 'Ludovicus Imperator, qui cognominatus est Almus vel Sanctus.' Dante speaks of Rome as 'alma Urbs' (*Epist.* V, tit.); 'alma Roma' (*Inf.* II, 20); synonymously with 'Urbs sancta' (*Mon.* II, 5, l. 106); 'sancta Città' (*Conv.* IV, 5, l. 53). He uses *almo* in a similar sense in *Paradiso* XXIV, 138: 'Poichè l' ardente spirto vi fece almi.'

[4] *Susurrium* was a recognised medieval word. Giovanni da Genova: '*Susurrium* in *susurro*, *-ras* vide'; and under *susurro*: 'unde *hoc susurrium*, *-rii*, murmur, latens locutio'; he quotes as an instance, *Job* IV, 12: 'et quasi furtive suscepit auris mea venas susurrii ejus,' where, however, the modern Vulgate reads *susurri*. Du Cange quotes instances of *susurrium* from St Jerome and St Bernard.

[5] See *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. XIII, 267 n.

[6] The *que* or *quaeque* of the printed editions is not represented in the MS., in which the scribe has confused the very similar abbreviations of *quod* and *pro*.

[7] The MS. *riuantur* is obviously corrupt. Moore proposes *moriatur*, thinking it probable that Dante had in mind the Biblical phrase in the Vulgate, I *Reg.* XIV, 39 (in A.V., I *Sam.*): 'absque retractatione morietur' (the only instance of the word *retractatio* in the Vulgate).

[8] *Kalendas Apriles* should be read with the MS. and Torri, not *Aprilis*; cf. *Kalendas Maias* in the colophon (according to Cod. Ven.) of *Epist.* VII; and *Kalendas Junias* in the colophon of the third (in the MS. order) of the Battifolle letters (*Epist.* VIII, in Torri; *Epist.* I* in Giuliani). For *sub fonte*, cf. the colophon of *Epist.* VII.

[9] The question as to whether these letters were written by Dante or not is left aside as not being within the scope of the present article.

[10] See below, p. 21, n. 5.

of the Emperor Henry VII, have been preserved, so far as is known, in the Vatican MS. alone. They were first printed by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epistolae* VIII—X), and were reprinted by Giuliani (*Epistolae* I*—III*). They are not included in Fraticelli's edition, nor in the Oxford Dante.

In the *apparatus criticus* T. = Torri; G. = Giuliani.

In the MS. there is a blank space before and after each of the letters. In each case the title and text (and in the case of the last, the colophon also) run on continuously. The first letter begins at l. 29 of fol. 58vo, and ends at l. 14 of fol. 59ro. The second begins at l. 15 of fol. 59ro, and ends at l. 32 of the same fol. The third begins at l. 33 of fol. 59ro, and ends at l. 13 of fol. 59vo.

Battifolle Letters—II.

(*Epist.* IX in Torri; *Epist.* II* in Giuliani.)

(29) Gloriosissime atq*ue* clement*i*ssime d*omi*ne d*omi*ne .M.[1] diuina (30) pr*o*uidentia Romanor*um* Regine et semp*er* Auguste .G.[2] (31) de bat*ifolle*[3] dej et adiuualis mag*nifici*ent*ie* g*rati*a comitissa *in* Tuscia (32) palatina ta*m* debite q*uam* deuote subiect*ion*is offic*ium* an*te* pedes.

Gra-(33)-tissima regie b*e*nignitatis ep*ist*ola et meis oculis uisa letanter (34) et ma*n*ibus fuit asu*m*pta reuerenter ut decuit cu*mque* sig*ni*fica-(35)-ta[4] *per* illam mentis acie*m* penetra*n*do dulcescere*n*t adeo sp*iritus*[5] (36) letitantis[6] feruore deuotion*is* incaluit ut nu*mquam* possi*n*t sup*er*are [fol. 59ro] oblia[7] nec memoria sine gaudio memorare. na*m* qua*n*ta uel quali*s* ego? ad e-(2)-narrandum[8] michi de sospitate co*n*sortis *et* sua ut*inam* diuturna coniunx (3) fortissima[9] cesaris co*n*descendat[10]? Quipe tanti pondus honoris atq*ue*[11] (4) merita gratulantis neq*ue* dig*ni*tas postulabat s*ed* nec *etiam*[12] inclinari huma-(5)-nor*um* *in*[13] graduum

[1] T. *Margaritae*; G. *Margaritae, Brabantis.* The use of the initial alone, for the name, in the 'salutatio' of a letter, except in the case of a Pope, was according to rule. In the *Formularius de modo prosandi* of Baumgartenberger (c. 1300) it is laid down: 'Nomen papae ex integro debet poni in salutacione...quod non fit in aliis. In aliis quidem pro persona mittentis seu etiam recipientis prima litera proprii nominis ponitur.' (*apud* Rockinger, *Über Briefsteller und Formelbücher des Mittelalters*, p. 729).

[2] T. *C.*; G. *Catharina.* [3] T.G. *Battifolle.*

[4] MS. *magnificata* corrected to *significata* by the expunctuation of *ma* and the superscription of *si*.

[5] In MS. before *spiritus* is *p* expunctuated.

[6] *Sic*; T.G. *lectitantis.* [7] *Sic*; T.G. *oblivia.*

[8] G. *qualis ego, ut ad e.*; T. *qualis ego? ad e.* [9] T.G. *fortissimi.*

[10] In MS. before *condescendat* is *consi*, which has been expunctuated.

[11] T.G. *neque.* [12] T.G. *sua; nec tam.* [13] T.G. omit *in.*

dedecuit[1] apicem unde uelut a viuo fonte *sancte*[2] ciuilitatis (6) exe*m*pla debent *in*ferioribus emanare. Dignas itaq*ue* p*er*soluere grates no*n* (7) opis est ho*min*is uer*um* ab ho*m*i*n*e alienu*m* esse no*n* reor. p*ro* *in*suffitientie suplem*en*-(8)-to deu*m* exorare q*uandoque*[3] Nu*n*c ideo regnj siderij iustis p*re*cibus atq*ue* pijs aula (9) pulsetur *et* impetret supplicantis affectus quat*enus* mu*n*di gubernator et*er*nus (10) co*n*descensuj tan*to* p*re*mia cohequata[4] retribuat *et* ad auspitia Cesaris *et* (11) Auguste dexteram gra*ti*e coaiutricis extendat ut qui romanj p*r*incipa-(12)-tus i*m*perio barbaras nat*i*ones et ciues i*n* mo*r*talium tutamenta sube-(13)-git delirantis euj familia*m* sub trihumphis *et* glo*r*ia suj henricj (14) reformet i*n* melius.

Proposed emendations in the text of the second Battifolle letter as printed by Torri (Epist. IX*) and Giuliani (Epist.* II*).*

Title. *For* C. (*Torri*), Catharina (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS.*) G.[5]

Text. *For* conjunx fortissimi Caesaris, *read* (*with MS.*) conjunx fortissima[6] Caesaris.

For sua; nec tam inclinari, *read* (*with MS.*) sed nec etiam inclinari.

For sacrae civilitatis, *read* (*with MS.*) sanctae civilitatis.

For exorare, *read* (*with MS.*) exorare quandoque.

For praemia eo aequata (*Torri*), *read* (*with MS. and G.*) praemia coaequata.

Battifolle Letters—III.

(*Epist.* X in Torri; *Epist.* III* in Giuliani.)

(15) Serenissime atq*ue* pijssime do*m*i*n*e do*m*i*n*e .M.[7] celestis mise*r*a-tio*n*is i*n*tu-(16)-itu Romanor*um* Regine *et* semp*er* Auguste deuotissima sua (17) .G.[8] de batefolle[9] dej et Imp*er*ij[10] gra*ti*a largiente comitissa i*n* tuscia palat*ina* fle-(18)-xis hu*m*iliter genibus reuere*n*tie debitu*m* exibere[11].

[1] T.G. *decuit.* [2] T.G. *sacrae.* [3] T.G. omit *quandoque.*
[4] T. *eo aequata*; G. *coaequata.*
[5] The initial in MS. is undoubtedly G. not C. Ricci (*L' Ultimo Rifugio di Dante*, p. 17) thinks the lady in question may have been Gherardesca di Donoratico, wife of Guido di Simone da Battifolle.
[6] The epithet appears rather empty as applied to the Emperor, 'Caesar et Augustus.'
[7] G. *Margaritae*; T. *M.* [8] T. *C.*; G. *Catharina.*
[9] MS. *battefolle*, with the first *f* expunctuated; T.G. *Battifolle.*
[10] T.G. *Imperatoris.* [11] T.G. *exhibet.*

Regalis epistole documenta (19) gratuita ea qua potui veneratione recepi intellexi[1] deuote. sed cum de prosperitate (20) successuum uestri felicissimj cursus familiariter[2] intimata concepi[3] quanto libens (21) animus concipientis arriserit[4] placet potius commendare silentio tamquam nuntio meliorj (22) non enim uerba significando suffitiunt ubi mens ipsa quasi debria[5] superatur. Itaque (23) supleat regie celsitudinis apprehentio que[6] scribentis humilitas explicare non potest. (24) At quamuis insinuata per literas inefabiliter grata fuerint et iocunda. spes am-(25)-plior tamen et letandi causas accumulat et simul uota iusta confectat spero equidem (26) de celesti prouisione confidens quam numquam[7] falli uel prepediri posse non dubito et (27) que humane ciuilitati de principe singulari prouidit quod exordia uestri regnj (28) felitia semper in melius prosperata procedent sic igitur in presentibus et futuris exul-(29)-tans de[8] Auguste clementia[9] sine ulla hesitatione recurro et suppliciter[10] tem-(30)-pestiua deposco quatenus me sub umbra tutissima uestri culminis taliter[11] (31) collocare digneminj ut cuiusque[12] sinistrationis ab estu sim semper et uidear (32) esse secura.

Proposed emendations in the text of the third Battifolle letter as printed by Torri (*Epist.* X) *and Giuliani* (*Epist.* III*).

Title. *For* C. (*Torri*), Catharina (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS.*) G.[13]

Text. *For* recepi et intellexi, *read* (*with MS.*) recepi, intellexi.

For accepi, *read* (*with MS.*) concepi[14].

For animus concipientis arripiat (*Torri*), *read* (*with MS. and G.*) arriserit.

For quasi ebria, *read* (*with MS.*) quasi debria[15].

For quod scribentis, *read* (*with MS.*) quae scribentis.

For nullam unquam (*Torri*), *read* (*with MS. and G.*) nunquam.

For supplicatione tempestivâ, *read* (*with MS.*) suppliciter tempestiva.

[1] T.G. *recepi et intellexi.*
[2] T. *familiater.*
[3] T.G. *accepi.*
[4] T. *arripiat*; G. *arriserit.*
[5] T.G. *ebria.*
[6] T.G. *quod.*
[7] T. *nullam unquam*; G. *nunquam.*
[8] T.G. *ad.*
[9] T.G. *clementiam.*
[10] T.G. *supplicatione.*
[11] G. *totaliter*; T. *taliter.*
[12] T.G. *cujuscumque.*
[13] See p. 21, n. 5.

[14] Cf. 'animus concipientis' in the next sentence; and 'ea quae continebantur in ipsa [pagina] cum tota cordis hilaritate concepi,' at the beginning of the first Battifolle letter (below, p. 23).

[15] *Debrius* is not registered by Giovanni da Genova in the *Catholicon*; he, however, gives '*Debrio, -as*, ex *de* et *ebrio, -as*; et potest ibi *de* esse intentivum vel privativum.' Du Cange registers *debriatus* and *debriatio.*

For totaliter collocare (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS. and T.*) taliter collocare.

For cujuscumque sinistrationis, *read* (*with MS.*) cujusque sinistrationis.

Battifolle Letters—I.

(*Epist.* VIII in Torri; *Epist.* I* in Giuliani.)

(33) Illustrissime atq*ue* pijssime d*omi*ne d*omi*ne[1] Margarite diuina p*rou*identia (34) Romanor*um* Regine *et* semp*er* Auguste fidelissima sua .G.[2] de batifolle[3] (35) dej et i*m*p*er*ialis i*n*dulgentie g*rati*a comitissa i*n* tuscia palat*ina* cu*m* p*ro*mptissima (36) reco*m*mendat*ione* se ipsam et uolu*n*tariu*m* ad obsequia famulatu*m*.

Cum (37) pagina u*estr*e serenitatis apparuit an*te* scribentis *et* gratulan*tis* asp-(38)-ectum exp*er*ta est mea pura fidelitas q*uam*[4] *in* d*omi*norum successibus ta*m*[5] sub-(39)-ditor*um* fideliu*m* colletentur Nam p*er* ea que co*n*tinebantu*r* in ipsa cum (40) tota cordis hilaritate co*n*cepi qualiter dextera su*m*mj regis uota cesa*r*is [fol. 59vo] et Auguste feliciter adimplebat. proinde gradum mee fidelitatis (2) exp*er*ta petentis audeo ia*m* inire offi*tium* ergo ad audientia*m* u*estr*e sublimitatis (3) exorans et suppliciter p*re*cor et deuote deposco quat*enus* m*en*tis oculis i*n*tuerj (4) digneminj p*re*libate i*n*terdu*m* fidej puritate*m*. Ver*um* q*uia*[6] no*n* nulla regalium (5) clausurar*um*[7] uidebatu*r* ortari ut si quando nu*n*tior*um* facultas adesset celsitudi-(6)-ni regie aliquid p*er*optando[8] de status mei co*n*dictio*ne* referrem q*uam*uis q*ue*dam (7) p*re*sumpti*o*nis faties interdicat obedientie t*amen* suadente uirtute obediam. (8) Audiat ex quo iubet romanor*um* pia et serena maiestas q*uoniam*[9] te*m*pore (9) missionis p*rese*ntiu*m* coniu*n*x p*re*dilectu*s et* ego dei dono uigebamus i*n*colu-(10)-mes liberor*um* sospitate gaudentes ta*n*to solito letiores qua*n*to signa (11) resurgentis i*mper*ij meliora ia*m* sec*u*la p*ro*mittebant.

Missu*m* de castro poppij (12) .XV. kal*end*as Iunias faustissimj cursus henrici cesaris ad Italia*m* a*n*no (13) primo.

[1] T.G. omit the second *domine*.
[2] T. *C.*; G. *Catharina*.
[3] T.G. *Battifolle*.
[4] G. *quantum*; T. *quam*.
[5] T.G. *pectora*.
[6] G. *quoniam*; T. *quia*.
[7] G. *clausularum*; T. *clausurarum*.
[8] T.G. *praeoptando*.
[9] T.G. *quod*.

Proposed emendations in the text of the first Battifolle letter as printed by Torri (Epist. VIII) and Giuliani (Epist. I).*

Title. *For* piissimae dominae Margaritae, *read* (*with MS.*) piissimae dominae, dominae Margaritae[1].

For C. (*Torri*), Catharina (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS.*) G.[2]

Title. *For* quantum in dominorum successibus (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS. and T.*) quam in d. s.

For pectora subditorum, *read* animi subditorum[3].

For verum quoniam nonnulla (*Giul.*), *read* (*with MS. and T.*) verum quia n.

For quod tempore, *read* (*with MS.*) quoniam tempore[4].

§ V.

Epistola II (To the Counts Oberto and Guido of Romena).

This letter is one of the seven which, so far as is known, have been preserved in the Vatican MS. alone[5]. As in the case of *Epistola* VI, extracts from it, in German, were printed by Witte in 1838 in *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*[6]. The Latin text was first printed by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epist.* II), and was reprinted, with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli (*Epist.* II) and Giuliani (*Epist.* II), and in the Oxford Dante[7] (*Epist.* II).

In the *apparatus criticus* T. = Torri; F. = Fraticelli; G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante.

In the MS. the letter, which is preceded by a separate heading of two lines and a half, begins at l. 17 of fol. 59vo, and ends at l. 3 of fol. 60ro.

(14) Hanc ep*ist*olam scripsit dantes allagerij[8] Oberto et Guidonj comitibus (15) de Romena post mort*em* Alexandri comitis de Romena patrui eorum (16) co*n*dolens illius[9] de obitu suo.

[§ 1.] (17) Patruus uester Alexander comes illustris qui diebus p*ro*ximis cele-(18)-stem unde uenerat se*cun*dum sp*iri*t*um*[10] remeauit ad

[1] For the repetition of *domina*, see the titles of the other two Battifolle letters (above).
[2] See p. 21, n. 5.
[3] The *tā* of the MS. is more likely to be a corruption of *āi* (*animi*) than of *pectora*. Another suggestion is that *tā* is a mistake for *cā*, an irregular abbreviation of *corda*.
[4] The use of *quoniam* for *quod* is not uncommon in medieval texts (see Du Cange, s.v. *Quoniam*).
[5] See above, p. 14. [6] See above, p. 1, n. 1. [7] See above, p. 5.
[8] T. *Alligherii*; F. *Allagerii*; G. *Allagherius*; O. *Alighierius*.
[9] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *illis*. [10] T. *spem*; F.G.O. *spiritum*.

patriam. dominus meus (19) erat *et* memoria[1] eius usque quo sub tempore uiuam dominabatur[2] michi quando (20) magnificentia sua que super astra nunc affluenter[3] dignis premijs me netatur[4] (21) me sibi ab annosis temporibus sponte sua fecit esse subiectum[5]. Hec equidem cunctis (22) alijs uirtutibus comitata in illo suum nomen pre titulis Italorum ereum[6] illustra-(23)-bat et quid aliud heroica sua signa dicebant nisi senticam[7] uitiorum (24) fugatricem ostendimus argenteas etenim senticas[8] in purpureo deferrebat (25) extrinsecus *et* intrinsecus mentem iam more[9] uirtutum uitia repellentem (26) doleat ergo doleat progenies maxima tuscanorum[10] que tanto uiro fulgebat (27) et doleant omnes amici eius *et* subditi quorum spem mors crudeliter uerbera-(28)-uit inter quos ultimos me miserum dolere oportet qui a patria pul-(29)-sus *et* exul immeritus infortunia mea rependens continuo cura[11] spe memet (30) consolabat[12] in illo

[§ 2.] sed quamquam sensualibus amissis doloris amaritudo incumbat (31) si considerentur intellectualia que supersunt sane[13] mentis oculis lux dulcis (32) consolationis exoritur nam qui uirtutem[14] honorabat in terris nunc a uirtutibus (33) honoratur in celis *et* qui Romane aule palatinus erat in Tuscia (34) nunc regie sempiterne aulicus preelectus[15] in superna[16] Ierusalem cum beatorum (35) principibus gloriatur. Quapropter carissimj dominj mej supplici exorta-(36)-tione uos deprecor quatenus modice dolore[17] uelitis *et* sensualia postergare (37) nisi prout uobis exemplaria esse possunt *et* quemadmodum ipse iustissimus (38) bonorum sibi uos instituit[18] in heredes si[19] ipsi uos tamquam proximiores ad (39) illum mores[20] eius egregios induatis

[§ 3.] ego autem preter hec me uestrum (40) uestre discretioni excusso de abscentia lacrimosis exequijs quia nec negli-(41)-gentia neue ingratitudo me tenuit. Sed inopina paupertas quam fecit [fol. 60ro] exilium. Hec etiam uelut effera persecutrix[21] equis armisque uacantem iam (2) sue captiuitatis me detrusit in antrum *et* nitentem cunctis exurgere (3) uiribus hucusque preualens impia retinere molitur.

[1] T. *memoriam*; F.G.O. *memoria*.
[2] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *dominabitur*.
[3] T. *affluentius*; F.G.O. *affluenter*.
[4] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *muneratur*.
[5] T.F.G.O. *subditum*.
[6] F.G.O. *heroum*; T. *aereum*.
[7] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *scuticam*.
[8] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *scuticas*.
[9] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *in amore*.
[10] G. *Tuscorum*; T.F.O. *Tuscanorum*.
[11] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *cara*; Witte apparently read *curam*—he renders: 'stets meine Sorgen durch die Hoffnung auf ihn beschwichtigte.'
[12] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *consolabar*.
[13] G. *sanae*; T.F.O. *sane*.
[14] T.F.G.O. *virtutes*.
[15] T. *praelectus*; F.G.O. *praeelectus*.
[16] T. *supernam*; F.G.O. *superna*.
[17] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *dolere*.
[18] T. *constituit*; F.G.O. *instituit*.
[19] *Sic*; T.F.G.O. *sic*.
[20] MS. *momores*, with the first *mo* expunctuated.
[21] MS. *persecutris* corrected to *persecutrix*.

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. II.

Title. *For* Aligherius, *read* Alagherii[1].
l. 10. *For* subditum, *read* (*with MS.*) subjectum.
l. 12. *For* heroum, *read* (*with MS. and Torri*) aereum[2].
ll. 24—5. *For* infortunia mea rependens, continuo cara spe memet..., *read* infortunia mea rependens continua cura, spe memet...[3].
l. 31. *For* virtutes, *read* (*with MS.*) virtutem.

§ VI.

Epistola III (To Moroello Malaspina).

This letter, like the preceding, is one of the seven which, so far as is known, have been preserved in the Vatican MS. alone[4]. It was first printed by Witte in 1842 in *Dante Alighieri's Lyrische Gedichte, übersetzt und erklärt von K. L. Kannegiesser und K. Witte* (Zweiter Theil, pp. 235—6). It was printed independently by Torri in the same year in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epist.* III), and was reprinted,

[1] See note on title of *Epist.* VII, above.

[2] There is not the least doubt about the MS. reading, which is unmistakably *ereum=aereum*, 'of bronze.'—'Suum nomen prae titulis Italorum aereum illustrabat,' i.e. caused his name to stand out, as it were graven in bronze (or 'lasting as bronze'—cf. 'aere perennius') above the empty titles (or 'fame') of his fellow-countrymen. (For the use of *titulus* in this sense cf. *Epist.* IV, ll. 10—12: 'ut...titulum mei nominis ampliares,' i.e. that you might enhance the renown of my name.) Torri renders: 'illuminava il suo nome scolpito in bronzo avanti a' titoli degl' Italiani.' For the adoption of the 'facilior lectio' *heroum*, Witte appears to have been responsible; for in his article, *Neu aufgefundene Briefe des Dante Allighieri* (see above, p. 1, n. 1), in which he gives a German translation of nearly the whole of the above letter, he renders: 'seinen Namen über die Verdienste anderer italienischer *Helden* verherrlichte'; and in a review of Torri's edition of Dante's letters (*Torris Ausgabe von Dantes Briefen*, see above, p. 3, n. 2), he ridicules Torri (whose rendering of the passage he ignores) for reading *aereum*. In the course of a discussion of this letter he says: 'Gleich darauf heisst es, die Grossmuth habe den Namen des Verstorbenen über die Verdienste anderer italienischen Helden verherrlicht (*prae titulis Italorum heroum*). In der Handschrift steht allerdings *ereum*, doch lag die Berichtigung nahe genug und war in meinem oft erwähnten Aufsatz angedeutet, aus dem auch bei Hrn. Torri (S. XXXIII) abgedruckt ist: *sopra degli altri eroi dell' Italia*. Dennoch heisst es im Texte *aereum*, so dass all die Grossmuth dem Alessandro hiernach den Beinamen des *ehernen* verschafft hätte!' (*D.-F.* I, 494). It seems highly improbable, however, that a scribe with *heroum* before him should have written *eroum* (without *h*) (which a subsequent copyist, we are to suppose, corrupted further into *ereum*), inasmuch as *heros* and its compounds seem invariably to have retained the aspirate; and, further, the same scribe has written *heroica* (with the *h*) correctly in the very next line of this same letter.

[3] This emendation, which is due to a friend, is preferable to that of the printed editions, inasmuch as it retains *cura*, and gets rid of the feeble expression *cara spe*. It seems better to read *continua* rather than *continuo*; but if the latter be allowed to stand, it could bear the meaning of 'continuously,' in which sense it is used by Quintilian, and by medieval writers. Uguccione da Pisa, in his *Magnae Derivationes*, says (s.v. *teneo*): 'Item a *continuus*, *continue* adverbium, pro quo saepe ponitur *continuo*, idest continuatim, vel statim sine interpolatione.'

[4] See above, p. 14.

with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli (*Epist.* III) and Giuliani (*Epist.* III), and in the Oxford Dante[1] (*Epist.* III). A critical text was printed (c. 1902) in Oddone Zenatti's posthumous work, *Dante e Firenze* (pp. 431—2); and another was printed in 1903 by Francesco Torraca in his review of Zenatti's book in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S. x, 143. A photographic reproduction from the Vatican MS., with a transcript (not entirely accurate[2]), was published in 1909 by Francesco Novati in *Dante e la Lunigiana* (pp. 518—20).

Portions of this letter were incorporated by Boccaccio in a letter of his own ('Ignoto Militi,' beginning, 'Mavortis miles extrenue'). The text of Boccaccio's letter is printed in full, with the parallel passages from Dante's letter, by G. Vandelli, in *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, N.S. VII, 64—7, from the Laurentian MS. XXIX, 8, the only MS. in which it has been preserved, and in which, as H. Hauvette has shown in his *Notes sur des Manuscrits Autographes de Boccace à la Bibliothèque Laurentienne* (pp. 22 ff.), it is written in Boccaccio's own hand.

In the *apparatus criticus* W. = Witte; T. = Torri; F. = Fraticelli; G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante; Z. = Zenatti; Ta. = Torraca; N. = Novati; B. = Boccaccio.

In the MS. the letter, which is preceded by a separate heading, consisting of a single line, begins at l. 5 of fol. 60ro, and ends in the middle of l. 25 of the same fol.

(4) Scribit Dantes do*mi*no Maroello[3] marchionj malaspine.

[§ 1.] (5) Ne lateant do*mi*n*um* uincula se*r*ui suj q*uam*[4] affectus gratuitatis[5] do*mi*nantis[6] (6) et ne alia relata p*ro* alijs q*ue* falsar*um* opinionu*m* seminaria freq*ue*n-(7)-tius esse solent negligente*m*[7] p*re*dice*n*t carceratu*m* ad *co*nspectu*m* Ma-(8)-gnificentie u*estr*e p*rese*ntis oraculj[8] serie*m* placuit destinare.

[§ 2.] Igitur (9) michi a limine suspirare[9] postea curie seperato *in* qua uelut se-(10)-pe[10] sub admirat*ione* uidistis fas fuit sequi libertatis

[1] See above, p. 5.
[2] In l. 17 *pulsus* is omitted, and for *sola in sua* the transcript reads *ad sola sua*.
[3] F.G.O.Ta. *Moroello*; W.T.Z. *Maroello*.
[4] W.F.G.O.N. *quem*; Z.Ta. *quae*; T. *quam*; for *sui quam*, Wicksteed suggests *suique*.
[5] W. *gratuitae generositatis*; F.G.O. *gratitudinis*; Z. (followed by Wicksteed) *gratuitatio*; Ta. *gravitas*; T.N. *gratuitatis*.
[6] F.G.O.N. *dominantur*; W. *dominantis servum reddiderat*; T.Z.Ta. *dominantis*.
[7] T.F.G.O. *negligenter*; W.Z.Ta. *negligentem*.
[8] F. (following a conjecture of W.)G.O. *oratiunculae*; W.T.Z.Ta. *oraculi*.
[9] W.T.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *suspiratae*.
[10] W. omits *saepe*.

offitia[1] cum (11) primum pedes iuxta Sarni fluenta securus *et* incautus defigerem (12) subito heu mulier ceu fulgur descendens apparuit nescio quomodo (13) meis auspitijs undique moribus *et* forma[2] conformis, o quam[3] in eius apparitione[4] (14) ostupui sed stupor subsequentis tonitruj terrore cessauit nam sicut (15) diurnis[5] coruscationibus illico succedunt tonitrua sic inspecta flama (16) pulcritudinis huius[6] amor terribilis *et* imperiosus me tenuit. atque hic ferox (17) tamquam dominus pulsus a patria post longum exilium sola in sua repatrians (18) quicquid enim[7] contrarium fuerat intra[8] me uel occidit uel expulit[9] uel (19) ligauit. occidit ergo propositum illud laudabile quo a mulieribus[10] suis (20) cantibus[11] abstinebam. ac meditationes asiduas quibus tam celestia (21) quam terrestria intuebat[12] quasi suspectas[13] impie relegauit[14] *et* denique (22) ne contra se amplius anima rebellaret liberum meum ligauit arbitrium (23) ut non quo ego sed quo ille uult me uerti oporteat. Regnat[15] itaque (24) amor in me nulla refragante[16] uirtute[17] qualiterque me regat inferius (25) extra sinum presentium requiratis[18].

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. III.

l. 2. *For* gratitudinis, *read* (*with MS. and Torri*) gratuitatis[19].

l. 5. *For* negligenter, *read* (*with MS. and Witte*) negligentem.

l. 7. *For* oratiunculae, *read* (*with MS. and Torri*) oraculi[20].

[1] In MS. there is a straight stroke over the *a*, which has the appearance of being an accidental mark (or perhaps an unusually heavy stroke to mark the previous *i*), rather than a mark of abbreviation, which is invariably slightly curved in the MS.

[2] T.F.G.O. *fortunae*; W.Z.Ta. *forma*; so B.

[3] W. *quantum*; T.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *quam*; so B.

[4] T.F.G.O. *admiratione*; W.Z.Ta. *apparitione*; so B.

[5] F.G.O.Ta. *divinis*; so apparently B; W.T.Z. *diurnis*.

[6] T.F.G.O. *ejus*; W.Z.Ta. *hujus*; so B.

[7] W.F.G.O. *ei*; T. *eidem*; Ta. *ejus*; so B.; Z. *enim*.

[8] Ta. *in*; so B.; W.T.F.G.O.Z. *intra*.

[9] T. *expulsit* (!).

[10] T. *muliebribus* (a suggestion of W., approved by Z.); W.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *mulieribus*; N. suggests *mulcebribus*.

[11] W.F.G.O. *suisque cantibus*; T.Z. *suis cantibus*; Ta. *satis cautus*; W. suggests *meis in cantibus*.

[12] W.T.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *intuebar*.

[13] T. *suspectans*; W.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *suspectas*.

[14] T. *religavit*; W.F.G.O.Z.Ta. *relegavit*.

[15] T.G. *Regnet*; W.F.O.Z.Ta. *Regnat*.

[16] B. *refragrante*.

[17] W. omits *nulla refragante virtute*.

[18] B. *queratis*.

[19] Cf. 'documenta gratuita,' in the third Battifolle letter (see above, p. 22). Zenatti's *gratuitatio*, derived, as he thought, from the reading of the MS., has been shown by Novati (*L' Epistola di Dante a Moroello Malaspina*, in *Dante e la Lunigiana*, pp. 523—4) to be the outcome of a delusion. What Zenatti confidently took for *o*, Novati has no difficulty in proving to be *s*, as it had previously always been assumed to be.

[20] On this use of the word *oraculum*, see Novati's above-mentioned article (pp. 527—9), where he quotes another instance, from a letter of Boccaccio*: 'Deprecor affectanter quatenus gratia vestri oraculi possim admissum solatium reassumere.'

* The same letter ('Ignoto Militi') in which Boccaccio has incorporated passages from this letter of Dante's (see above, p. 27).

l. 16. *For* fortunae, *read* (*with MS. and Witte*) forma[1].
l. 17. *For* admiratione, *read* (*with MS. and Witte*) apparitione[2].
l. 19. *For* divinis, *read* (*with MS., Witte, and Torri*) diurnis[3].
l. 21. *For* ejus, *read* (*with MS. and Witte*) hujus[4].
l. 25. *For* ei, *read* (*with Boccaccio*) ejus[5].

§ VII.

Epistola I (*To Niccolò da Prato*).

This letter, like the two preceding ones, is one of the seven which, so far as is known, have been preserved in the Vatican MS. alone. It was first printed by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epist.* I), and was reprinted, with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli (*Epist.* I) and Giuliani (*Epist.* I), and in the Oxford Dante (*Epist.* I)[6]. The text was printed from the MS. in Zenatti's *Dante e Firenze* (pp. 359—60).

In the *apparatus criticus*, T. = Torri; F. = Fraticelli; G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante; Z. = Zenatti.

In the MS. the heading of the letter (consisting of five lines and a half) begins at l. 26 of fol. 60ro, and ends in the middle of l. 31. The text of the letter, which immediately follows the heading without a break, begins in the middle of l. 31, and ends at l. 31 of fol. 60vo.

(26) Reuerendissimo *in* chr*isto* patri d*omi*nor*um* suor*um* carissimo d*omi*no Richo*lao*[7] (27) mis*erati*one celesti ostiensi *et* vallatrensi ep*iscopo* apo*stol*ice sedis legato (28) necnon *et*[8] tuscia[9] roma*niola*[10] *et* marc*hia*[11] t*ervisina*[12] et p*ar*tib*us* circu*m* adiacentib*us* patiario (29) p*er* sacros*anc*tam ecl*es*iam ordinato, deuotissimj filij. A*lexander* c*apitaneus con*silium et (30) uniu*ersitas* p*ar*tis albor*um* de florentia semet ipsos deuotissime atq*ue* (31) p*ro*mptissime reccomendant.

[1] Boccaccio reads *forma*.
[2] This was likewise the reading of Boccaccio.
[3] Boccaccio (if the transcripts of his letter are to be trusted) read *divinis*. The reading of our MS. is unmistakably *diurnis*—the meaning would be, 'such as happen in our every day experience.'
[4] So also Boccaccio.
[5] The MS. reading *enim* is more likely a copyist's error for *eius* (the reading of Boccaccio) than for *ei*.
[6] See above, p. 5.
[7] *Sic*; T.F.O.Z. *Nicholao*; G. *Nicolao*.
[8] F.G.O.Z. *in*; T. *et*.
[9] T. *Tusciae*; F.G.O.Z. *Tuscia*.
[10] T. *Romaniolae*; F.G.O.Z. *Romaniola*.
[11] T. *Marchiae*; Z. *Marchia*; F.G.O. *Maritima*.
[12] T.F.G.O. *terris*; Z. *tarvisina*; in the MS. the abbreviation of this word (which was first correctly explained by Del Lungo) is written *t.* with *i* superscript.

[§ 1.] Preceptis salutar*ibus* moniti *et* apo*sto*lica (32) pietate rogati sacre uocis *con*textuj que*m* misistis post cara nobis *con*-(33)-scilia respond*e*mus *et* si negligentie sontes aut *in*gnauie cen-(34)-seremur ob *in*iuria*m* tarditatis citra iuditiu*m* discretio *san*cta (35) u*e*stra p*re*-ponderet[1] et qua*n*tis qualib*usque con*scilijs *et* responsis obs*er*ua-(36)-ta sinceritate consortij u*e*stra[2] fraternitas decenter *pro*cedendo indi-(37)-geat *et*[3] examinatis que tangim*us* ubi forte *contra* debita*m* celeritate*m* (38) defecisse despicimur ut affluentie[4] u*e*st*re* b*e*nignitatis *in*dulgeat de-(39)-*pre*camur

[§ 2.] ceu filij non *in*grati literas[5] igitur pie paternitatis[6] aspexim*us* [fol. 60v°] que totius u*e*stri[7] desiderij p*er*sonantes exordia subito m*en*tes nost*r*as subi-(2)-to[8] tanta letitia p*er*fuderun*t*[9] quan*tam* nemo ualeret seu u*er*bo seu cogi-(3)-tat*ione* metirj na*m* q*uam* fere p*rae*[10] desiderio so*m*niantes *in*hiabamus patrie sa-(4)-nitatem[11] u*e*stra*rum* l*itera*r*um* series plusq*uam* semel sub paterna monit*ione* poluxi*t*[12]. (5) et ad quid aliud *in* ciuile bellu*m* corruim*us* q*uid* aliud candida u*e*stra[13] signa (6) petebant et ad q*uid* aliud enses et tela u*e*stra[14] rubea*nt*[15] nisi ut q*ui* ciuilia (7) iura temeraria uoluptate[16] tru*n*cauera*nt* *et* iugo pie legis colla (8) su*m*mitte-re*nt* *et* ad pace*m* patrie cogeren*tur*? Quipe no*st*re intenti-(9)-onis cuspis legiptima de neruo que*m* tendebam*us* p*ro*ru*m*pens quie-(10)-tem solam *et* libertate*m* popu*l*j Florentinj petebat. Petijt[17] atq*ue* pe-(11)-tet *in* poster*um* q*uod* si tam[18] gratissimo nobis b*e*nefitio uigilatis *et* aduer-sarios (12) no*st*ros p*ro*ut s*an*cta conam*in*a no*st*ra[19] uoluer*in*t ad sulcos bone ciuilitatis (13) *in*tenditis remeare quis uobis dignas grates p*er*solu*e*re atentabit? (14) Nec opis e*st* no*st*re pa*ter*[20] nec q*uic*q*uid* Florentine gentis repe*ri*t*ur* in t*er*ris (15) s*ed* si qua celo e*st* pietas q*ue* talia remuneranda[21] p*ro*spitiat illa uo-(16)-bis p*re*mia digna ferat q*ui* tante urbis mise*ri*cordia*m* *in*duistis *et* ad se-(17)-danda ciuiu*m*[22] p*ro*fana litigia festinatis.

[1] G. *perpendat*; T.F.O.Z. *praeponderet*.
[2] T.F.G.O.Z. *nostra*.
[3] G. *At*; T.F.O.Z. *et*.
[4] T.F.G.O.Z. *affluentia*.
[5] T.G. *deprecamur, ceu filii non ingrati. Literas*—F.O.Z. *deprecamur. Ceu filii non ingrati literas*.
[6] F.G.O. *paternitatis vestrae*; T.Z. *paternitatis*.
[7] F.G.O.Z. *nostri*; T. *vestri*.
[8] T.F.G.O.Z. omit *subito* here.
[9] F. *perfunderunt* (!).
[10] T.F.G.O. *pro*; Z. *prae*.
[11] T. *libertatem*; F.G.O.Z. *sanitatem*.
[12] T.F.G.O.Z. *pollicetur*.
[13] T.F.G.O.Z. *nostra*.
[14] T.F.G.O.Z. *nostra*.
[15] T.F.G.O.Z. *rubebant*; Novati proposes *ruebant*.
[16] T. *voluntate*; F.G.O.Z. *voluptate*.
[17] F.G.O.Z. *petit*; T. *petiit*.
[18] T. *tantum*; F.G.O.Z. *tam*.
[19] T. omits *nostra*.
[20] T. *proprium*; F.G.O.Z. *pater*.
[21] T.G. *remunerando*; F.O.Z. *remuneranda*.
[22] MS. *ciuilium*, the *li* being expunctuated.

[§ 3.] Sane cu*m* *per* *sanc*te religi-(18)-onis viru*m* fr*atr*em .L. ciuilitatis p*er*suasorem *et* pacis p*re*moniti at-(19)-q*ue* requisitj sum*us* instanter p*ro* uobis q*uem*admod*um* et ipse u*est*re l*ite*re *con*ti-(20)-nebant ut ab om*ni* guerrar*um* *in*sultu cessaremus et usu et nos (21) ipsos in paternas man*us* u*est*ras exiberemus *in* totu*m* nos filij deuotis-(22)-simj uobis et pacis amatores *et* iusti exuti iam[1] gladijs ar-(23)-bitrio u*est*ro spontanea *et* sincera uoluntate subim*us* ceu relatu (24) p*re*fatj u*est*ri nu*n*tij fr*atr*is .L. narabit*ur* *et* *per* publica instr*ument*a sole*m*pniter (25) celebrata liquebit.

Idcirco pietati clem*en*tissime u*est*re filialj uoce (26) affectuosissime supplicamus quat*enus* illa*m* diu exagitata*m* Floren*tiam* (27) sopore tranquillitatis et pacis irrigare uelitis ei*usque* semper (28) popul*um* defensantes nos et q*ui* nost*ri* sunt iuris ut pius pater com-(29)-mendatos h*abe*re qui uelut a patrie caritate nu*n*qu*am* destitim*us* sic (30) de p*re*ceptor*um* u*est*ror*um* limitibus nu*n*qu*am* exorbitare i*n*tendimus s*ed* sem*per* (31) tam debite q*uam* deuote quibuscu*m*q*ue* u*est*ris obedire mandatis.

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. I.

Title. *For* Maritima, terris, *read* Marchia Tervisina[2].

l. 16. *For* Paternitatis vestrae aspeximus, *read* (*with MS.*) Paternitatis aspeximus.

l. 18. *For* subito mentes nostras tanta letitia, *read* (*with MS.*) subito mentes nostras subito tanta laetitia.

l. 21. *For* pro desiderio, *read* (*with MS.*) prae desiderio.

l. 24. *For* pollicetur, *read* (*with MS.*) polluxit[3].

[1] In MS. between *exuti* and *iam* is a curved line (the beginning of the *g* of *gladiis*), which is expunctuated.

[2] Del Lungo, to whom the correct interpretation of the MS. reading is primarily due, refers (*Dino Compagni e la sua Cronica*, II, 587 n.) to the Bulls of Benedict XI, dated Jan. 31, 1304, constituting Cardinal Niccolò da Prato legate and pacificator in Tuscany, Romagna, and the March of Treviso. Cf. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, p. 2030, No. 25348: 'Nicolao Ostiensi episcopo in partibus Tusciae in imperio constitutis, Romaniola et marchia Tervisina...plenae legationis officium committit'; and No. 25349: 'Eundem in provinciis Tusciae, Romaniolae, marchiae Tarvisinae ac partibus circumiacentibus constituit pacis conservatorem ac paciarium.'

[3] Every printed edition of this letter reads *pollicetur* here, yet the MS. reading *polūx* is perfectly plain. This was recognised by Zenatti (who made a fresh collation of the MS.) in his *apparatus criticus*, where he says 'quasi *polluxit*'; yet he printed *pollicetur* in his text. Apparently Z. was not aware of the existence of the verb *pollucere*, which is registered by Giovanni da Genova in the *Catholicon*: '*Polluceo*, *-luceo* componitur cum *post*, vel *procul*, vel *porro*, et dicitur *polluceo*, *-ces*, *-xi*, *-ctum*, *-cere*, idest dono, promitto, quia promissis solemus polliceri et donis; vel *pollucere* est offerre, quia post sacrificium solent fieri oblationes.'

l. 27. *For* rubebant, *perhaps read* (*with Novati*) ruebant[1].

l. 37. *For* conamina nostra, *read* conamina vestra[2].

§ VIII.

Epistola V (*To the Princes and Peoples of Italy*).

The Latin text of this letter has been preserved in one other MS. besides the Vatican MS., namely *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome, a fourteenth century MS., which contains also the Latin text of Dante's letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII)[3].

This letter was first printed in an early Italian translation (attributed, like that of the letter to Henry VII, to Marsilio Ficino), by Pietro Lazzari, in *Miscellaneorum ex MSS. libris Bibliothecae Collegii Romani Societatis Jesu tomus primus* (pp. 139—144), which was published at Rome in 1754. Another text, from *Cod. Riccardiano* 1304, was printed by Ignazio Moutier at Florence in 1823, in Vol. VIII (pp. lvii—lxiii) of his edition of *La Cronica di Giovanni Villani.* An amended text was printed by Witte at Padua in 1827, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epistola quinta*, pp. 19—26)[4]; and Witte's text was reprinted, with further emendations, at Florence in 1840 by Fraticelli in his edition (*Epist.* II, pp. 213—22).

The Latin text of the letter was first printed (from an unidentified MS.) by Francescomaria Torricelli in the *Antologia di Fossombrone* for 22 Oct. 1842. It was first printed from the Vatican MS. by Torri in 1842, in his edition of Dante's letters (*Epist.* V), and was reprinted, with emendations, in the editions of Fraticelli (*Epist.* V) and Giuliani (*Epist.* V), and in the Oxford Dante (*Epist.* V)[5].

[1] The MS. reading *rubeant* is obviously corrupt. Novati (*Le Epistole di Dante*, in *Lectura Dantis: Le Opere Minori di D. A.*, 1906, p. 310) regards it as 'semplice errore di copista per *ruebant*,' and thinks Dante had in mind the Virgilian phrase 'in arma ruere' (*Aen.* XI, 886). Those who read *rubebant* explain the word, either as 'were crimson with blood' (as, for instance, Zenatti, who thinks the reference is to the fighting in the Mugello in 1302 and 1303); or as 'flashed in the sun' (as Fraticelli, who renders 'scintillavano'; or Del Lungo, who thinks the reference is to 'il fatto di Lastra' of 20 July 1304, and points to the details of Dino Compagni's account of the incident in his *Cronica*, III, 10). In favour of *rubebant* in the former sense would be the rhetorical antithesis to 'candida signa' in the previous sentence.

[2] The confusion in the MS. between *vestra* and *nostra* is frequent; in this passage the correction of *nostra* to *vestra* seems obviously required; the writers would hardly speak of their own '*sancta* conamina,' whereas the epithet would be eminently appropriate as applied to the Papal Legate (cf. 'sacrae vocis,' l. 2; and 'discretio sancta vestra,' ll. 6—7, of this same letter).

[3] See above, p. 4. I have unfortunately not yet been able to procure a collation of this MS.

[4] See above, p. 5.

[5] See above, p. 5.

In the *apparatus criticus*, for the Latin text, Tc. = Torricelli[1]; T. = Torri; F². = Fraticelli (1857); G. = Giuliani; O. = Oxford Dante; for the Italian text, L. = Lazzari; M. = Moutier; W. = Witte; F¹. = Fraticelli (1840).

In the MS. the heading of the letter (consisting of three lines) begins at l. 32 of fol. 60ᵛᵒ; there is a considerable hiatus in the middle of l. 33, and there is a second hiatus at the end of l. 34, leaving the last part of the heading and the commencement of the text of the letter incomplete. The letter itself begins, in the middle of a sentence, at l. 35 of fol. 60ᵛᵒ, and ends in the middle of l. 8 of fol. 62ʳᵒ, the rest of which is left blank, without colophon or any indication that it is the end of the MS. On the left-hand margin of fol. 60ᵛᵒ, alongside the heading of the letter is written in red and, according to Zenatti[2], in the hand of Francesco da Montepulciano, the owner of the MS.[3], 'Epistola Dantis in florentinos.' Besides the hiatus in the heading and at the beginning of the letter already mentioned, there are more or less considerable hiatus in l. 36 of fol. 60ᵛᵒ, l. 20 of fol. 61ʳᵒ, and in ll. 3, 4, 6, 7, 32, 33 of fol. 61ᵛᵒ.

(32) Uniuersis et singulis Italie Regibus et senatoribus alme (33) urbis necnon [4] atque populis humilis Italus (34) Dantes Alagerij[5] florentinus et exul immeritus or [6] [§ 1.] [7] (35) tempus acceptabile quo signa surgunt consolationis et pacis, nam (36) dies noua spendescit[8] al [9] demostrans[10] que[11] iam (37) tenebras diuturne calamitatis attenuat iamque aure orien-(38)-tales crebrescunt rutilat celum in labijs suis et auspitia gentium (39) blanda serenitate confortat. et nos gaudium expectatum[12] uide-(40)-bimus qui diu pernotitauimus[13] in deserto. Quoniam[14] titan exorietur [fol. 61ʳᵒ] pacificus et iustitia sine sole quasi

[1] The variants from Torricelli's text (of which I have not been able to procure a copy) are registered by Torri in his edition (pp. 151—2).

[2] See *Dante in Firenze*, pp. 377—8. [3] See above, p. 1.

[4] Hiatus in MS.; T. *necnon gentibus atque populis*; F².G.O. *necnon ducibus, marchionibus, comitibus, atque populis*; L.M.W.F¹. *A tutti ed a ciascuno* (M. *e ciascuni*) *re d' Italia ed a' senatori di Roma, a'* (L. *et*) *duchi*, (M. *e*) *marchesi*, (F¹. *e*) *conti ed a tutti i popoli.*

[5] T. *Allagherii*; G. *Allagherius*; O. *Alighierius*; F². *Alagerii.*

[6] Hiatus in MS.; T.F².G.O. *orat pacem*; L.M.W.F¹. *prega pace.*

[7] Hiatus in MS.; Tc. *Ecce nunc tempus*; T.F².G.O. *Ecce nunc*; L.M.W.F¹. *Ecco ora il tempo accettabile.*

[8] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *splendescit.*

[9] Hiatus in MS.; T.G. *alborem*; Tc.F².O. *albam*; L.M.W.F². *mostrando da Oriente l' Aurora.*

[10] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *demonstrans.* [11] T.G. *qui*; Tc.F².O. *quae.*

[12] T. *exoptatum*; Tc.F².G.O. *expectatum*; L.M.W.F¹. *l' aspettata allegrezza.*

[13] *Sic*, no doubt for *pernoctitauimus*; T.F².G.O. *pernoctauimus*; L. *dimoriamo*; M.W.F¹. *dimorammo.* [14] Tc. *quum*; T.F².G.O. *quoniam.*

elietropium hebetata[1] cum primum iubar (2) ille uibrauit[2] reuirescet saturabuntur omnes qui exuriunt[3] *et* sitiunt in (3) lumine radiorum eius *et* confundentur qui diligunt iniquitatem a fatie coru-(4)-scantis. Arrescit[4] namque aures misericordes[5] leo fortis de tribu Iuda (5) atque ululatum uniuersalis[6] captiuitatis miserans Moisen (6) alium[7] suscitauit qui de grauaminibus egiptiorum populum suum erripiet (7) ad terram lacte ac mele[8] manantem perducens.

[§ 2.] Letare iam nunc miseranda Italia (8) etiam saracenis que statin inuidiosa per orbem uideberis quia sponsus tuus (9) mundi solatium et gloria plebis tue clementissimus[9] henricus diuus *et* Au-(10)-gustus *et* cesar ad nuptias properat exica[10] Lacrimas et meroris ue-(11)-stigia dele pulcerrima nam prope est qui liberabit te de carcere impiorum (12) qui percutiens malignantes in ore gladij perdet eos *et* uineam suam aliis locabit (13) agricolis. qui fructum iustitie reddant in tempore messis.

[§ 3.] Sed non an[11] miserebitur (14) cuiquam[12] imo ignoscet omnibus misericordiam implorantibus cum sit Cesar (15) et maiestas eius de fonte defluat pietatis Huius iuditium omnem se-(16)-ueritatem abhorret *et* semper citra medium plectens ultra medium pre-(17)-miando se figit. Anne propterea nequam[13] hominum applaudet audatias[14] (18) et initis[15] presumptionum[16] pocula propinabit? absit quoniam Augustus (19) est *et* si Augustus nonne relapsorum facinora uindicabit et usque (20) in tesaliam persequetur. tesalia[17] inquam[18] finalis delectionis[19].

[§ 4.] pone sangu [20] lon-(21)-gobardorum coadductam barberiem et si quid de troianorum latinorumque (22) semine superest

[1] F². *quasi ad h. h.*; G.O. *q. ut h. h.*; T. *quasi heliotropium h.*; L.M.W.F¹. *senza luce al termine della retrogradazione impigrita.*

[2] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *vibraverit.*

[3] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *esuriunt.*

[4] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *arrexit.*

[5] Tc. *misericordiae*; T.F².G.O. *misericordes.*

[6] MS. *uniuersalistis*, with the final *tis* expunctuated.

[7] T. *alterum*; F².G.O. *alium*; L.M.W.F¹. *un altro.*

[8] Tc. *melle et lacte*; T.F².G.O. *lacte ac melle.*

[9] Tc. *clemens*; T.F².G.O. *clementissimus*; L.M.W.F¹. *pietosissimo.*

[10] *Sic*; T.F².G.O. *exsicca.*

[11] Tc. *Sed an*; T.F².G.O. *Sed an non.*

[12] T. *Augustus*; Tc. *cuique*; F².G.O. *cuiquam*; L.M.W.F¹. *d' alcuno.*

[13] Tc.T. *nequiorum*; F².G.O. *nequam.*

[14] T.F².G.O. *audaciis.*

[15] T.F².O. *initiis*; Tc. *initibus*; G. *rictibus*; Boehmer (*Dante-Jahrbuch*, I, 396) proposes *ineptiis*; L.M.W.F¹. *dolce e piano* (obviously derived from a reading, or supposed reading, *mitis*).

[16] G. *praesumptiosorum*; T.F².O. *praesumptionum*; L. *beveraggi prosumptuosi*; M. *b. per superstiziosi*; W. *b. presuntuosi*; F¹. *b. perniziosi.*

[17] T.F².G.O. *Thessaliam*; Tc. *Thessalia.*

[18] Tc. *ignis*; T.F².G.O. *inquam.*

[19] T.F².G.O. *deletionis*; L.M.W.F¹. *dilezione*; the Italian translation renders the foregoing sentence (*et usque...delectionis*) as follows: L.W.F¹. *ed insino in Tessaglia perseguirà Tessaglia, ma perseguiralla di finale dilezione*; M. *e i. in T. perseguiterà, per T. seguirallo infinale dilezione.*

[20] Hiatus in MS.; T.F².G.O. *Pone, sanguis L.*; L.M.W.F¹. *O sangue de' Longobardi, pon giuso.*

illi[1] cede [2] cum sublimis aquila fulguris instar descen-(23)-dens affuerit abiectos uideat pullos eius et prolis proprie locum coruulis (24) occupatum. eya facite scandinauie soboles ut cuius merito trepi-(25)-datis aduentum quod[3] ex uobis est presentiam scitiatis[4]. nec seducat allu-(26)-dens[5] cupiditas more sirenum nescio qua dulcedine uigiliam rationis (27) mortificans preocupatis[6] fatiem eius in confessione subiectionis et psalterio (28) penitentie iubiletis considerantes quia[7] potestati resistens dej ordinationi (29) resistit et qui diuine ordinationi repugnat uoluntati omnipoten-(30)-tie coequalj recalcitrat et durum est contra stimulum calcitrare.

[§ 5.] Vos (31) autem qui lugetis oppressi animum subleuate quoniam prope est uestra salus asum-(32)-mite rastrum bone humilitatis atque glebis exuste animositatis occatis (33) agellum sternite mentis uestre ne forte celestis imber sementem uestram (34) ante iactum preueniens in uacuum de altissimo cadat non[8] resiliet[9] gratia (35) dei ex uobis tamquam ros cotidianus ex lapide sed uelut fecunda ual-(36)-lis concipite[10] ac uiride germinetis[11] uiride dico fructiferum[12] uere pa-(37)-cis qua quidem uiriditate uestra terra uernante nouus agricola (38) Romanorum conscilij suj boues ad aratrum affectuosius et confiden-(39)-tius coniugabit. parcite parcite iam exnunc[13] o carissimj qui mecum (40) iniuriam passi[14] estis ut hectoreus pastor uos oues de ouilj suo [fol. 61v°] cognoscat cui etsi animaduersio[15] temporalis diuinitus est indulta tamen (2) ut eius bonitatem redoleat a quo uelut a puncto biffurcatur petri cesaris-(3)-que potestas uoluptuose famili [16] miseretur.

[§ 6.] (4) Itaque si culpa uetus non obest que plerumque suppi

[1] T. *illis*; F².G.O. *illi*; L.M.W.F¹. *a lui*.
[2] Hiatus in MS.; T.F².G.O. *ne*; L.M.W. *acciocchè...veggia*; F¹. *acciocchè...non veggia*.
[3] T.F².G.O. *quantum*; L.M.W.F¹. *in quanto*.
[4] *Sic*; T.G. *sentiatis*; F².O. *sitiatis*; L. *vogliate*; M.W.F¹. *godiate*.
[5] *Sic*; T.F¹.G.O. *illudens*; L.M.W.F¹. *ingannatrice*.
[6] T.F².G.O. *Praeoccupetis*; L.M.W.F¹. *Occupate*.
[7] T.F².G.O. *quod*; Tc. *quia*; L.M.W.F¹. *che*.
[8] F².G.O. *neve*; T. *non*; Tc. *non enim*.
[9] T.F².G.O. *resiliat*; Tc. *resiliet*; L.M.W.F¹. *nè torni indietro* (M. *addietro*).
[10] F².O. *concipiatis*; T.G. *concipite*; L.M.W.F¹. *concepete*.
[11] G. *germinate*; T.F².O. *germinetis*; L.M.W.F¹. *producete*.
[12] Tc. *fructiferorum*; T.F².O. *fructiferum*.
[13] G. *et nunc*; T.F².O. *ex nunc*; L.M.W.F¹. *oggimai*.
[14] Tc. *pasti*; T.F².G.O. *passi*; L.M.W.F¹. *avete sofferta*.
[15] In MS. before *animaduersio* is *aduersario*, which has been expunctuated.
[16] Hiatus in MS.; T. *voluptuosae familiae libentius miseretur*; F².O. *voluptuose familiam suam corrigit, libentius vero ejus miseretur*; G. *voluptuose familiae suae miseretur*; L.M.W.F¹. *desiderosamente la sua famiglia correggye, ma* (M. *ma a sè*) *più volonterosamente misericordia tribuisce*; Barbi (in *Bull. Soc. Dant.*, N.S., II, 23 n.) supplies the hiatus as follows from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *voluptuose familiam suam corrigit sed ei voluptuosius miseretur*.

[1] (5) et uertitur in seipsam huic[2] utrique[3] potestis aduertere pacem unicuique (6) [4] et [5] erate letitie iam primitias degustare. Euigi-(7)-late igitur omnes *et* asurgite regi uestro [6] non (8) solum sibi ad Imperium *sed* ut liberi ad regimen reseruati.

[§ 7.] Nec (9) tantum[7] ut asurgatis exortor *sed* ut illius obstupescatis aspectum[8] (10) qui bibitis fluenta eius eiusque maria nauigatis qui calcatis are-(11)-nas litorum et alpium summitates que sunt sue qui publicis qui-(12)-buscumque gaudetis *et* res priuatas uinculo sue legis non aliter (13) possidetis. Nolite uelut ignari decipere uosmet ipsos tamquam som-(14)-niantes in cordibus *et* dicentes dominum non habemus. ortus enim eius (15) et lacus est quod celum circuit. nam dei est mare et ipse fecit (16) illud et aridam fundauerunt manus est[9]. unde[10] deum romanum (17) principem predestinasse relucet in miris effectibus. *et* uerbo uerbj con-(18)-firmasse propreerius[11] profitetur ecclesia.

[§ 8.] Nempe si a creatura mun-(19)-di inuisibilia dej per ea que facta sunt intellecta[12] conspitiuntur *et* si (20) ex notioribus nobis[13] innotiora simpliciter[14] interest[15] humane apprehensi-(21)-onj ne[16] per motum celi motorem intelligamus *et* eius uelle facile prede-(22)-stinatio hec *etiam* leuiter intuentibus innotescat[17]. Nam si a prima huius (23) ignis[18] reuoluamus preterita ex quo scilicet argis hospitalitas est[19]

[1] Hiatus in MS.; T.F[2].G.O. *plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur*; Tc. *plerumque supervenit...et vertitur*; L.M.W.F[1]. *spesse volte come serpente si storce, ed in sè medesima si travolge* (M. *si travoglie*); Barbi (*loc. cit.*) supplies the hiatus from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *plerumque suppinatur ut coluber et vertitur.*

[2] F[2].G.O. *hinc*; T. *huic*; L.M.W.F[1]. *quinci.*

[3] G. *ubique*; T.F[2].O. *utrique*; L.M.W.F[1]. *ed all' uno ed all' altro.*

[4] Hiatus in MS.; T. *unicuique gratissimam et*; F[2].G.O. *u. esse paratam et*; Tc. *uniuscujusque et*; L.M.W.F[1]. *a ciascuno essere apparecchiato* (L. *apparecchiata*); Barbi (*loc. cit.*) supplies the hiatus from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *unicuique preparari et.*

[5] Slight hiatus in MS.; T. *oratae*; Tc.F[2].G.O. *speratae*; L.W. *di disperata*; M. *di sperata*; F[1]. *di insperata*; Barbi (*loc. cit.*) from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *insperate* (MS. *insperare*).

[6] Hiatus in MS.; T.F[2].G.O. *incolae Italiae*; L.M.W.F[1]. *o abitatori d' Italia*; Barbi (*loc. cit.*) from Cod. S. Pantaleo 8: *incole Latiales.*

[7] T. *nec tamen*; F[2].G.O. *nec tantum*; L.M.W.F[1]. *nè solamente.*

[8] G. *aspectu*; T.F[2].O. *aspectum.*

[9] *Sic*, by an obvious scribal error for *eius*, the word exactly above in the previous line being *est*; T.F[2].G.O. *ejus.*

[10] G. *Et*; Tc. *Undique*; T.F.O. *Unde.*

[11] *Sic*; T.F[2].G.O. *posterius*; L.W.F[1]. *essere poscia confermato*; M. *essere posto e c.*

[12] T.F[2].O. *intellectu*; G. *intellecta.*

[13] Tc. omits *nobis.*

[14] Tc.T.F[2].G.O. *similiter*; Boehmer (*Dante-Jahrbuch*, I, 396) proposes *si similiter.*

[15] G. *innotescunt*; T.F[2].O. *interest.*

[16] T.F[2].G.O. *ut*; L.M.W.F[1]. *sicchè.*

[17] T.F[2].G.O. *innotescet*; L.W.F[1]. *sieno chiare*; M. *fieno chiari.*

[18] T. *a prima hujus origine*; F[2].G.O. *a prima hujus ignis favilla*; L.M.W.F[1]. *dalla prima favilla di questo fuoco.*

[19] T.F[2].G.O. omit *est.*

a (24) frigibus deregata[1] et usq*ue* ad octauianj triumphos mundj (25) gesta reuis*er*e uacet nulla[2] eor*um* uidebim*us* hum*a*ne uirtutis omnino (26) culmina tran*s*cendisse *et* deu*m* p*er* hom*in*es tamquam p*er* celos nouos aliquid (27) oper*a*tu*m* fuisse, non eternj[3] semp*er* nos agimus quin[4] inter*dum* uten*s*ilia (28) dei sumus ac uoluntates hu*m*ane quibus inest ex natura libertas (29) *etiam* inferioris affectus immunes quandoque aguntur et obnoxie uoluntati (30) eterne sepe illj ancillantur ignare

[§ 9.] *Et* si hec que ubi[5] principia sunt (31) ad probandum quod queritur non sufficiunt[6] quis non ab illata conclusi-(32)-one[7] p*er* talia p*re*cedentia[8] [9] cum opinari cogetur? pace[10] videlicet[11] (33) annorum duodecim orbem totaliter amplexata[12] que[13] sui silogiza [14] (34) fatiem[15] dei filium[16] sicuti opere patrato ostenditur[17]? Et hic cum ad reue-(35)-lationem spiritus homo factus euangelizaret in terris quasi dirimens (36) duo regna sibi *et* cesari uniuersa distribuens alterutri (37) duxit[18] reddi que sua sunt.

[§ 10.] Quod[19] si pertinax animus[20] poscit ulterius (38) nondum annuens ueritati uerba christi examinet *etiam* iam ligatj (39) cuj cum potestatem suam pilatus obiceret lux nostra de sursum esse aseruit [fol. 62ro] quod ille iactabat qui Cesaris ibi auctoritate vicaria gerebat officium. Non (2) igitur ambuletis sicut *et* gentes[21] ambulant in uanitate sensus (3) tenebris obscurati, sed aperite oculos mentis uestre ac uidete quoniam (4) regem nobis celi *et*[22] terre dominus ordinauit. Hic est quem petrus (5) dej uicarius honorificare nos monet. quem Clemens nunc (6) petri successor luce apostolice benedictionis illuminat ut ubi ra-(7)-dius spiritualis non sufficit ibi splendor minoris lumi-(8)-naris[23] illustret.

[1] *Sic*; Tc.F².O. *denegata*; T. *derogata*; G. *defraudata*; L.M.W.F¹. *negata*.
[2] T.F².G.O. *nonnulla*; L.M.W.F¹. *molte cose*.
[3] Tc.T.F².G.O. *etenim*; L.M.W.F¹. *ed in verità non sempremai*.
[4] T. *quia*; F².G.O. *quin*; L.M.W.F¹. *anzi*.
[5] T.F².G.O. *uti*; L.M.W.F¹. *siccome*. [6] T. *sufficient*; F².G.O. *sufficiunt*.
[7] Tc. *ad illatam conclusionem*; T.F².G.O. *ab illata conclusione*; L.M. *della conceduta conclusione* (W.F¹. omit).
[8] F².G.O. *procedendo*; T. *praecedentia*; L.M.W.F¹. *innanzi passando*.
[9] Hiatus in MS.; T. *ita mecum*; F².G.O. *nobiscum*.
[10] Tc. *in pace*; F².G.O. *pacem*; T. *pace*.
[11] T. *vidimus*; F².G.O. *videns*; Tc. *videlicet*; L.M.W.F¹. *cioè*.
[12] F².G.O. *amplexatam*; T. *amplexata*. [13] G. *qua*; T.F².O. *quae*.
[14] Hiatus in MS.; T.F².G.O. *syllogizatoris*; L.M.W.F¹. *del suo sillogizzatore*.
[15] Tc.G. *facies*; T.F².O. *faciem*. [16] Tc. *filius*; G. *filii*; T.F².O. *filium*.
[17] F².O. *ostendit*; T.G. *ostenditur*.
[18] T.G.O. *dixit*; F². *duxit*; L.M.W.F¹. *commandò*. [19] Tc. *quare*; T.F².G.O. *quod*.
[20] Tc.G. *aliquis*; T.F².O. *animus*; L.M.W.F¹. *animo*. [21] Corrected from *gens*.
[22] T.F².G.O. *ac*.
[23] Tc. *luminis*; T.F².G.O. *luminaris*; M.W.F¹. *lume* (L. omits).

Proposed emendations in the Oxford text of Epist. v.

Title. *For* Alighierius, *read* Alagherii[1].

l. 9. *For* pernoctavimus, *read* pernoctitavimus[2].

ll. 43—4. *For* audaciis, *read* (*with MS.*) audacias[3].

l. 44. *For* initiis, *read* (*with Torricelli*) initibus[4].

l. 58. *For* quantum ex vobis est, *read* (*with MS.*) quod ex vobis est.

l. 64. *For* considerantes quod, *read* (*with MS.*) considerantes quia[5].

l. 76. *For* neve resiliat, *read* (*with MS. and Torricelli*) non resiliet.

l. 79. *For* concipiatis, *read* (*with MS.*) concipite.

ll. 92—3. *For* libentius vero ejus miseretur, *read* sed ei voluptuosius miseretur[6].

l. 95. *For* plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur, *read* plerumque supinatur ut coluber et v[7].

ll. 97—8. *For* unicuique esse paratam et speratae laetitiae, *read* unicuique praeparari et insperatae laetitiae[8].

l. 100. *For* incolae Italiae, *read* incolae Latiales[9].

l. 121. *For* intellectu, *read* (*with MS.*) intellecta[10].

l. 129. *For* hospitalitas a Phrygibus denegata, *read* hospitalitas est a P. derogata[11].

[1] See note on title of *Epist.* VII, above.

[2] I have found no other instance of *pernoctitare*, but the MS. reading *pernotitauimus* obviously is intended for *pernoctitavimus*; cf. *letitantis* for *lectitantis* at the beginning of the second Battifolle letter (see above, p. 20). Frequentative forms are common in medieval texts; numbers of examples are to be found in the *Catholicon*.

[3] *Applaudere* in the sense of 'to applaud' is regularly constructed with the accusative.

[4] *Initibus* seems preferable to *initiis*, which, as a 'facilior lectio,' would naturally tend to displace the rarer word.

[5] For this use of *quia* in place of *quod*, cf. *Mon.* III, 9, ll. 116—17: 'Quum Petrus audivisset quia Dominus esset'; and *Matt.* x, 34 (quoted in *Mon.* III, 9, ll. 132—3): 'Nolite arbitrari quia pacem venerim mittere in terram' (Dante reads 'veni'); and Peter Damian, *De Quadragesima* (Cap. ii): 'Audistis quia scripsit haec Moyses...?'

[6] The hiatus here, and in the following passages, is supplied by Barbi (in his article on Scartazzini's *Dantologia* in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. II, p. 23, note) from *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8, in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome.

[7] As supplied by Barbi (*loc. cit.*).

[8] As supplied by Barbi (*loc. cit.*)—*Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 reads *insperare*, an obvious error for *insperate* (i.e. *insperatae*). In the Vatican MS. *erate* (which Torri took to represent *oratae*) is evidently the second half of a word, of which the beginning was undecipherable by the copyist. *Insperatae*, supported as it is by the *disperata* of the Italian translation, is undoubtedly the correct reading.

[9] As supplied by Barbi (*loc. cit.*). For the use of *Latialis* in the sense of 'Italian,' cf. 'Latiale caput' (of Rome) in *Epist.* VIII, l. 150.

[10] *Intellecta*, which was suggested many years ago by Boehmer (see *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Dante-Gesellschaft*, I, 396), is obviously right, the passage being an almost *verbatim* quotation from the Vulgate: 'Invisibilia enim ipsius, a creatura mundi, per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta, conspiciuntur' (*Rom.* I, 20). Part of the same passage, as Boehmer points out, is quoted by Dante in the *De Monarchia*: 'Invisibilia Dei, per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur' (II, 2, ll. 72—3).

[11] It is difficult to decide whether the *deregata* of the MS. stands for *denegata* or *derogata* (as read by Torri). The weight of evidence is in favour of the former (e.g.

l. 145. *For* procedendo, *read* (*with MS.*) praecedentia.

ll. 146—7. *For* pacem videns annorum duodecim orbem totaliter amplexatam, *read* (*with MS.*) pace videlicet a. d. o. t. amplexata.

l. 149. *For* quae sui syllogizatoris faciem Dei filium...ostendit, *read* qua sui s. facies, Dei filius...ostenditur[1].

l. 153. *For* dixit, *read* (*with MS. and Frat.*) duxit.

l. 164. *For* ac, *read* (*with MS.*) et.

Whether all the emendations (to the number of between eighty and ninety) which have been proposed in the foregoing study find acceptance or not, it is abundantly evident that the printed text of the letters of Dante contained in the Vatican MS., as represented in the editions of Fraticelli and Giuliani, and in the Oxford Dante, is in need of very considerable revision.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

Since the above article was printed I have received a photographic reproduction of the text of *Epistles* V and VII as contained in *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8 in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome (see above, pp. 4, 32). I hope to print a supplementary article dealing with the S. Pantaleo text of these two letters in a subsequent number of the *Review*.

Torricelli reads *denegata*, and the Italian translation has *negata*), but it is not clear to what denial of hospitality to the Greeks by the Trojans the reference could be. (Wicksteed thinks the allusion is to the repulse of the Argonauts from the Simois by Laomedon, and the subsequent sacking of Troy by Hercules, and the rape of Laomedon's daughter, Hesione, followed by the rape of Helen in reprisal.) On the other hand, if *derogata* be read, the reference to the abuse of the hospitality of Menelaus by Paris, and the rape of Helen, would be obvious; while it is more likely that *denegata*, as 'facilior lectio,' should have been substituted by a copyist for *derogata*, than that the converse should have been the case.

[1] The combination of Torricelli's *syllogizatoris facies*, *Dei filius*, with the *ostenditur* of the Vatican MS., and the consequent necessary substitution of *qua* for *quae*, seems to afford a more satisfactory reading than that of the Oxford text.

DONNE'S SERMONS, AND THEIR RELATION TO HIS POETRY.

THE revival of interest in Donne's poetry which has occurred in recent years does not seem to have extended to his prose works. While his poems have been reprinted in excellent modern editions, the prose works are accessible only in their original seventeenth-century editions, or in Alford's so-called *Works of Donne* (1839)—a very unsatisfactory reprint with numerous omissions.

Yet these prose writings of Donne are valuable both in themselves, and in relation to his other works. Donne's intense individuality is evident in everything he produced, and the same characteristics that are stamped on his early love-poems and satires, as well as on the *Holy Sonnets* of his more sober middle life, are found also in all his prose works, from the clever but flippant *Paradoxes and Problems* or *Ignatius his Conclave* to the stately magnificence of his last sermons. It is true that the greater number of his poems belong to the emphatically unregenerate 'Jack Donne' of his youth, whilst the reverend and saintly Dr Donne of later years was responsible for most of the prose works, but the change in his life produced an alteration in the matter only, not the style, of his work. Whether as a poet he addressed the 'profane mistresses' of his youth, or the Christ of his later devotion, whether in prose he lightly discussed the possibility of women possessing a soul, or preached 'like an angel from a cloud' on righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, he shewed always the same agility of intellect, the same intensity of imagination. The ideas that dominate his poetry are never absent from his prose work, though the light in which they are viewed may be of a different colour. The delight in paradox, and in the 'discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike,' the somewhat cynical attitude towards women, the tendency to casuistry, above all the irresistible attraction towards the idea of death—these are the elements of Donne's prose work as of his poetry.

By far the larger part of this prose is contained in the volumes of sermons which were issued posthumously in 1640, 1649, and 166$\frac{9}{1}$. The remainder consists of *Pseudo-Martyr*, a controversial treatise published in 1610, designed to induce Roman Catholics to take the Oath of Allegiance; *Ignatius his Conclave*, a bitter little satire against the Jesuits, which appeared in 1611; *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions and Several Steps in my Sickness*, a curious record of Donne's illness in the winter of 1623, which was published early in 1624; and three works which were not published till after Donne's death, though they were composed comparatively early in his career—viz. *Iuvenilia*, published 1633, reprinted as *Paradoxes, Problems, Essays, Characters* in 1652[1], *Biathanatos*, published 1644, and *Essays in Divinity*, published 1651. There are also a few scattered sermons, published during Donne's lifetime and not reprinted in the posthumous collected editions.

A certain interest attaches itself to these minor prose works by reason of their reflection of various aspects of Donne's mind, but it is only in the *LXXX Sermons* of 1640 and the two succeeding volumes that his full powers as a prose-writer are displayed. It is true that these sermons suffer from the usual defects of seventeenth-century discourses; they are too long, they are based on a too literal interpretation of the Scriptures, their constant appeals to the Fathers become wearisome, and much of their argument seems to us mere verbal quibbling. In addition, they have faults of their own which are characteristic of Donne's work as a whole—errors of taste caused by a love of too ingenious conceits, an excessive inclination to paradox, and a morbid pre-occupation with the idea of death and its accompanying horrors. Yet when all these faults are admitted, the fact remains that these sermons are valuable not only for the light they throw on Donne's strangely fascinating character, but also for their intrinsic literary merits. Scattered broadcast throughout them are felicitous short phrases such as 'Certainly he that loves not the Militant Church, hath but a faint faith in his interest in the Triumphant[2],' or, at somewhat greater length, 'From that inglorious drop of rain, that falls into the dust, and rises no more, to those glorious Saints who shall rise from the dust, and fall no more, but, as they arise at once to the fulness of

[1] The edition of 1652 contains additional matter, of which some is certainly spurious.

[2] 'Preached at St Paul's upon Christmas Day, 1621.' Vol. II, 36, p. 330. As there is at present no critical edition of the prose works, reference is made, in each instance, to the first edition. The sermons are assigned to their volume (LXXX, 1640, being referred to as Vol. I; L, 1649, as II; XXVI, 166$\frac{9}{1}$, as III), the number of each sermon is then mentioned, and then the page. The spelling alone is modernised, in order to agree with the quotations from the poems, which are taken from the edition by E. K. Chambers, 1896.

Essential joy, so arise daily in accidential joys, all are the children of God, and all alike of kin to us[1],' whilst at times Donne's style exhibits a dignity and beauty that have seldom been surpassed in English prose.

God made Sun and Moon to distinguish seasons, and day and night, and we cannot have the fruits of the earth but in their seasons: But God hath made no decree to distinguish the seasons of his mercies; in Paradise, the fruits were ripe, the first minute, and in heaven it is always Autumn, his mercies are ever in their maturity....He brought light out of darkness, not out of a lesser light; he can bring thy Summer out of Winter, though thou have no Spring; though in the ways of fortune, or understanding, or conscience, thou have been benighted till now, wintred and frozen, clouded and eclipsed, damped and benumbed, smothered and stupefied till now, now God comes to thee, not as in the dawning of the day, not as in the bud of the spring, but as the Sun at noon to illustrate all shadows, as the sheaves in harvest, to fill all penuries, all occasions invite his mercies, and all times are his seasons[2].

Or,

We think not a friend lost, because he is gone into another room, nor because he is gone into another Land; and into another world, no man is gone; for that Heaven, which God created, and this world, is all one world. If I had fixed a Son in Court, or married a daughter into a plentiful Fortune, I were satisfied for that son and that daughter. Shall I not be so, when the King of Heaven hath taken that son to himself, and married himself to that daughter, for ever[3]?

Or again,

Divers men may walk by the Sea-side, and the same beams of the Sun giving light to them all, one gathereth by the benefit of that light pebbles, or speckled shells, for curious vanity, and another gathers precious Pearl, or medicinal Amber, by the same light....If thou canst take this light of reason that is in thee, this poor snuff, that is almost out in thee, thy faint and dim knowledge of God, that riseth out of this light of nature, if thou canst in those embers, those cold ashes, find out one small coal, and wilt take the pains to kneel down, and blow that coal with thy devout Prayers, and light thee a little candle, (a desire to read that book, which they call the Scriptures, and the Gospel, and the Word of God;) If with that little candle thou canst creep humbly into low and poor places, if thou canst find thy Saviour in a Manger, and in his swathing clouts, in his humiliation, and bless God for that beginning...thou shalt never envy the lustre and glory of the great lights of worldly men...thou shalt see, that thou by thy small light hast gathered Pearl and Amber, and they by their great lights nothing but shells and pebbles; they have determined the light of nature, upon the book of nature, this world, and thou hast carried the light of nature higher, thy natural reason, and even human arguments, have brought thee to read the Scriptures, and to that love, God hath set to the seal of faith. Their light shall set at noon; even in their height, some heavy cross shall cast a damp upon their soul, and cut off all their succours, and divest them of all comforts, and thy light shall grow up, from a fair hope, to a modest assurance and infallibility, that that light shall never go out, nor the works of darkness, nor the Prince of darkness ever prevail upon thee, but as thy light of reason is exalted by faith here, so thy light of faith shall be exalted into the light of glory, and fruition in the Kingdom of heaven[4].

[1] 'Preached at St Paul's Cross, 6 May 1627,' II, 41, p. 376.
[2] 'Preached at Paul's, upon Christmas Day, in the Evening, 1624,' I, 2, p. 13.
[3] 'Preached at St Paul's, upon Easter Day, 1627,' I, 22, p. 220.
[4] 'Preached at St Paul's, upon Christmas Day, 1621,' II, 36, pp. 325—327.

There are very few of the Sermons that do not contain at least one striking and impressive passage of this kind, and even the dreariest controversial arguments are lit up here and there by flashes of inspiration. Moreover the sanity and broad-mindedness of these discourses contrasts favourably with the tone of most of the theological literature of the time. Donne is curiously modern in some of the positions he takes up, e.g. with regard to miracles, heaven and hell, the relation of faith and reason. He says vigorously, 'It is but a slack opinion, it is not Belief, that is not grounded upon reason....Let no man think that God hath given him so much ease here, as to save him by believing he knoweth not what, or why. Knowledge cannot save us, but we cannot be saved without Knowledge; Faith is not on this side Knowledge, but beyond it; we must necessarily come to Knowledge first, though we must not stay at it, when we are come thither[1].'

And again in a passage that almost reminds us of Bunyan in its homely imagery, 'Implicit believers, ignorant believers, the adversary may swallow; but the understanding believer, he must chaw, and pick bones, before he come to assimilate him, and make him like himself[2].'

There is common-sense with a touch of humour in his treatment of Puritan extravagances:

> Humiliation is the beginning of sanctification; and as without this, without holiness, no man shall see God, though he pore whole nights upon the Bible; so without that, without humility, no man shall hear God speak to his soul, though he hear three two-hours Sermons every day[3].

And with regard to extempore preaching:

> We have here [i.e. in the Penitent Thief] one example of an extemporal Sermon; this Thief had premeditated nothing. But he is no more a precedent for extemporal preaching, than he is for stealing. He was a Thief before, and he was an extemporal preacher at last; but he teaches nobody else to be either[4].

It is, however, in their relation to his poems that perhaps the chief interest of Donne's prose works lies. There are in the sermons many passages which are strongly reminiscent of the language of the poems. Thus the famous comparison of the circle made by the pair of compasses in the 'Valediction Forbidding Mourning' re-appears in the 'Sermon preached at the Earl of Bridgewater's House' in 1627, though the application of the comparison is of a different nature. The wording of the idea is so similar that both passages may be quoted:

[1] 'Preached at St Paul's, upon Christmas Day, 1621,' II, 36, p. 325.
[2] 'Preached at St Paul's, in the Evening, upon Easter Day, 1623,' I, 18, p. 178.
[3] 'Preached upon Christmas Day,' I, 7, p. 73 (wrongly numbered as 75 in the edition of 1640).
[4] 'A Lent Sermon preached at Whitehall, February 20, 1617,' III, 1, p. 8.

If they be two, they are two so
As stiff twin compasses are two;
Thy soul, the fix'd foot, makes no show
To move, but doth, if th' other do.

And though it in the centre sit,
Yet, when the other far doth roam,
It leans, and hearkens after it,
And grows erect, as that comes home.

Such wilt thou be to me, who must
Like th' other foot, obliquely run;
Thy firmness makes my circle just,
And makes me end where I begun.

First then, Christ establishes a Resurrection, a Resurrection there shall be, for that makes up God's circle. The Body of Man was the first point that the foot of God's Compass was upon: first, he created the body of Adam: and then he carries his compass round, and shuts up where he began, he ends with the Body of Man again in the glorification thereof in the Resurrection[1].

The opening lines of the 'Obsequies of the Lord Harrington, Brother to the Countess of Bedford':

Fair soul which was, not only as all souls be,
Then when thou wast infusèd, harmony,
But didst continue so; and now dost bear
A part in God's great organ, this whole sphere

find their echo in the Sermon 'Preached at Paul's Cross to the Lords of the Council and other Honourable Persons, March 24, 1616':

Is the world a great and harmonious Organ, where all parts are played, and all play parts; and must thou only sit idle and hear it[2]?

In the greater number of such cases, the thought had been already expressed by Donne in poetry, before it found a way into his prose, so that, as Professor Saintsbury says, he 'did but trans-prose his verse, and trans-hallow his profanities,' but in one case, poem and sermon were written on the same occasion, and in one or two others, the sermon preceded the poem. The 'Sermon of Valediction at My Going into Germany, at Lincoln's Inn, April 18, 1619' and the 'Hymn to Christ, at the Author's Last Going into Germany,' give us the simultaneous outpouring of Donne's soul in prose and in verse, and the comparison of the two modes of expression makes an interesting study. It is impossible here to quote more than one short passage from each:

In my long absence, and far distance from hence, remember me, as I shall do you, in the ears of that God, to whom the farthest East, and the farthest West are but as the right and left ear in one of us....Remember me thus, you that stay in this Kingdom of peace, where no sword is drawn, but the sword of Justice, as I shall remember you in those Kingdoms, where ambition on one side, and a necessary defence from unjust persecution on the other side hath drawn many swords; and

[1] II, 1, p. 3. [2] III, 24, p. 343.

Christ Jesus remember us all in his Kingdom, to which, though we must sail through a sea, it is the sea of his blood, where no soul suffers shipwreck; though we must be blown with strange winds, with sighs and groans for our sins, yet it is the Spirit of God that blows all this wind, and shall blow away all contrary winds of diffidence or distrust in God's mercy[1].

In what torn ship so ever I embark,
That ship shall be my emblem of Thy ark;
What sea soever swallow me, that flood
Shall be to me an emblem of Thy blood;
Though Thou with clouds of anger do disguise
Thy face, yet through that mask I know those eyes,
Which, though they turn away sometimes,
They never will despise.

I sacrifice this island unto Thee,
And all whom I love there, and who love me;
When I have put our seas 'twixt them and me
Put Thou Thy seas betwixt my sins and Thee.
As the tree's sap doth seek the root below
In winter, in my winter now I go,
Where none but Thee, the eternal root
Of true love, I may know.

Some of the lines on 'A Sheaf of Snakes used heretofore to be my Seal, the crest of our poor Family' are a versification of the ideas which Donne had previously expressed in the 'Anniversary Sermon preached at St Dunstan's[2]' on the curse pronounced on the Serpent, 'And dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.'

Again, if the 'Hymn to God, my God, in my Sickness' was written, as Walton says, on Donne's death-bed, it contains imagery which Donne had already employed in the 'Sermon Preached upon Easter Day, 1629.' The poem runs thus:

Whilst my physicians by their love are grown
Cosmographers, and I their map, who lie
Flat on this bed, that by them may be shown
That this is my south-west discovery,
Per fretum febris, by these straits to die;

I joy that in these straits I see my west;
For, though these currents yield return to none,
What shall my west hurt me? As west and east
In all flat maps—and I am one—are one,
So death doth touch the resurrection.

Is the Pacific sea my home? Or are
The eastern riches? Is Jerusalem?
Anyan, and Magellan, and Gibraltar[3],
All straits, and none but straits are ways to them
Whether where Japhet dwelt, or Cham, or Shem.

[1] III, 19, pp. 280, 281.
[2] II, pp. 439—445.
[3] Chambers' edition contains a note of interrogation here, but Prof. H. J. Grierson tells me that the true reading should be a comma.

The sermon contains this passage:

> Who ever amongst our Fathers, thought of any other way to the Moluccas, or to China, than by the Promontory of Good Hope? Yet another way opened itself to Magellan; a Strait, it is true; but yet a way thither; and who knows yet, whether there may not be a North-East, and a North-West way thither, besides? Go thou to heaven, in an humble thankfulness to God, and holy cheerfulness, in that way that God hath manifested to thee; and do not pronounce too bitterly, too desperately that every man is in an error, that thinks not just as thou thinkest, or in no way that is not in thy way[1].

Instances of verbal correspondence between the poems and prose works might easily be multiplied, but the correspondence of ideas is more important. Certain characteristic features of the poems, such as the anti-chivalrous attitude towards woman, and the stress laid on the connection between body and soul, are almost equally conspicuous in the prose works. Donne's revolt against the poetical conventions of his day had been nowhere more evident than in his repudiation of the Petrarchian woman-worship that still dominated the Elizabethan sonneteers, and his cynical estimate of womankind.

The feeling expressed in

> Hope not for mind in women; at their best
> Sweetness and wit, they are but mummy possess'd[2].

and

> Though she were true when you met her,
> And last till you write your letter,
> Yet she
> Will be
> False, ere I come, to two or three[3].

had been the key-note of much of his love-poetry, and it is equally evident in the *Paradoxes and Problems*. The problem 'Why hath the Common Opinion afforded Women Souls?' gives him an opportunity for much satire. Among the reasons suggested—all of them unfavourable to women—are the characteristic ones,

> Have they so many advantages and means to hurt us (for, ever their loving destroyed us) that we dare not displease them, but give them what they will?...Or perchance because the Devil (who is all soul) doth most mischief, and for convenience and proportion, because they would come nearer him, we allow them some souls[4].

In later years Donne treated this subject with less levity. In the Sermon preached on the last Easter Day of his life, there is a reference which can hardly be disputed to his own early work:

[1] I, 24, p. 241.
[2] 'Love's Alchemy,' ll. 23, 24. (I have not followed Chambers' punctuation here, as it causes unnecessary difficulty.)
[3] Song, 'Go and catch a falling star,' ll. 23—27.
[4] *Juvenilia*, Problem VI.

For, howsoever some men out of a petulancy and wantonness of wit, and out of the extravagancy of paradoxes, and such singularities, have called the faculties, and abilities of women in question, even in the root thereof, in the reasonable and immortal soul, yet that one thing alone hath been enough to create a doubt, (almost an assurance in the negative) whether S. Ambrose's Commentaries upon the Epistles of St Paul be truly his or no, that in that book there is a doubt made, whether the woman were created according to God's Image...No author of gravity, of piety, of conversation in the Scriptures could admit that doubt, whether women were created in the Image of God, that is, in possession of a reasonable and an immortal soul.... Woman, as well as man, was made after the Image of God, in the Creation; and in the Resurrection, when we shall rise such as we were here, her sex shall not diminish her glory[1].

Yet in spite of this repudiation of his former heresy, it is clear from many of the Sermons that Donne held firm his belief in the inferiority of woman. 'The sphere of our loves is sublunary, upon things naturally inferior to ourselves,' was still his conviction. The various marriage sermons could hardly have been very pleasant hearing for any bride who possessed the slightest degree of spirit. 'She is but *Adjutorium*, but a Help: and nobody values his staff as he does his legs[2]....'

The *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* are equally uncomplimentary. 'God saw that Man needed a Helper, if he should be well, but to make Woman ill, the Devil saw, that there needed no third[3].'

Another characteristic idea of the poems is that of the importance of the body to the soul. This idea is apparent in the treatment of the paradox, 'That the gifts of the Body are better than those of the Mind[4],' which is elaborated in *Juvenilia*. In later life it served to check Donne's growing austerity, and counteracted to some extent his tendency to consider the body as a prison from which death alone could give release. In the 'Litany' in the *Divine Poems* he prays, 'From thinking us all soul, neglecting thus Our mutual duties, Lord, deliver us[5],'—lines which find a parallel in a passage in one of the Sermons:

Man is not all soul, but a body too; and, as God hath married them together in thee, so hath he commanded them mutual duties towards one another; and God allows us large uses of temporal blessings, and of recreations too[6].

And again, in a loftier strain,

...

And therefore be content to wonder at this, That God would have such a care to dignify, and to crown, and to associate to his own everlasting presence, the body of man....Marvel at this, at the wonderful love of God to the body of man, and thou wilt favour it so, as not to macerate thine own body, with uncommanded and

[1] 'Preached at St Paul's, upon Easter Day, 1630,' I, 25, pp. 242, 243.
[2] 'Preached at a Marriage,' II, 2, p. 14.
[3] *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*, 21, Meditation.
[4] *Juvenilia*, Paradox XI.
[5] 'Litany,' ll. 143, 144.
[6] 'Preached at St Paul's, 13 Oct., 1622,' II, 38, p. 351.

inhuman flagellations, and whippings, nor afflict their bodies, who are in thy charge, with inordinate labour; thou wilt not dishonour this body, as it is Christ's body, nor deform it, as it is thine own, with intemperance, but thou wilt behave thyself towards it so, as towards one, whom it hath pleased the King to honour, with a resurrection...and not to defer that resurrection long[1].

The 'metaphysical wit' of the poems is almost equally evident in the Sermons. Sometimes the simile employed, though unexpected, has a certain amount of force, as in the comparison of a good man's life to an engraving:

Be pleased to remember that those Pictures which are delivered in a minute, from a print upon a paper, had many days, weeks, Months time for the graving of these Pictures in the Copper; So this Picture of that dying Man, that dies in Christ, that dies the death of the Righteous, that embraces Death as a Sleep, was graving all his life; All his public actions were the lights, and all his private the shadows of this Picture[2].

Frequently, however, as in the poems, it is merely ingenious and fantastic.

He [God] purges us by his sunshine, by his temporal blessings; for, as the greatest globes of gold lie nearest the face and top of the earth, where they have received the best concoction from the heat of the sun; so certainly, in reason, they who have had God's continual sun-shine upon them, in a prosperous fortune, should have received the best concoction, the best digestion of the testimonies of his love, and consequently be the purer, and the more refined metal[3].

Deeper even than the correspondence in thought and expression lies the essential connection of poems and prose works. It is the 'quintessenced, passionate, melancholy imagination' of Donne, which pervades alike his poetry and his prose, and finds in both its chief delight in the contemplation of Love and Death, that forms the real link between the two modes of expression. Donne himself never tries to make his hearers forget that the saint of to-day is one with the sinner of yesterday. When he preached on the blessedness of the pure in heart, he closed his sermon with these words:

In seeing God, we shall see all that concerns us, and see it always; no night to determine that day, no cloud to overcast it. We end all, with St Augustine's devout exclamation...Glorious God, what kind of eyes shall they be!...How bright eyes, and how well set!...How strong eyes, and how durable!...What quality, what value, what name shall we give to those eyes?...I would say something of the beauty and glory of these eyes, and can find no words, but such as I myself have misused in lower things. Our best expressing of it, is to express a desire to come to it, for there only we shall learn what to call it. That so, we may go the Apostle's way, to his end, That being made free from sin, and become servants to God, we may have our fruit unto holiness, and then, the End, life everlasting[4].

[1] 'Preached at St Paul's, in the Evening, upon Easter Day, 1625,' I, 20, pp. 194, 197.
[2] 'Preached at Whitehall, Feb. 29, 1627' [162⅞], III, 15, p. 218.
[3] 'Preached at Greenwich, April 30, 1615,' III, 11, p. 164.
[4] 'Preached on Candlemas Day,' I, 12, p. 123.

There is a delightfully homely passage in the sermon preached on the last Easter but one of his life, that well expresses his humility and sincerity:

> I doubt not of mine own salvation; and in whom can I have so much occasion of doubt, as in myself? When I come to heaven, shall I be able to say to any there, Lord! how got you hither? Was any man less likely to come thither than I?[1]

The reality of Donne's change of heart only heightens by contrast the unchanged character of his mind. The object of desire may have altered, the thought of death may be accompanied, and at times swallowed up in, the contemplation of future glory, but the imagination and passion remained and gave their own peculiar melancholy and intensity to all Donne's work. From his earliest days Donne had dwelt, with a certain morbidness of fancy, on mortality and all its attendant circumstances. In one of his best-known poems he had spoken of the opening of his own grave, and the discovery of 'A bracelet of bright hair about the bone.' 'When I am dead' is the note that recurs again and again throughout the Songs and Sonnets, and in the *Anatomy of the World* Death was the theme that called forth all his powers. In the prose works this tendency to insist on the idea of death is equally evident. One of the early 'Paradoxes' propounded the theory 'That all things kill themselves,' and *Biathanatos* was written to justify Donne's own inclination towards the idea of suicide. The Sermons treat this theme continually, and the last of Donne's great discourses was that famous 'Death's Duel' that took for its motto 'Unto God the Lord belong the issues from death.'

This contemplation of death assumes a variety of forms. Sometimes it treats the physical aspect—corruption and decay—and is merely horrible and repulsive.

Sometimes it is the approach of death that is depicted, as in the Sermon preached before the Prince and Princess Palatine (June 16, 1619):

> The sun is setting to thee, and that for ever; thy houses and furnitures, thy gardens and orchards, thy titles and offices, thy wife and children are departing from thee, and that for ever; a cloud of faintness is come over thine eyes, and a cloud of sorrow over all theirs; when his hand that loves thee best hangs tremblingly over thee to close thine eyes, *Ecce Salvator tuus venit*, behold then a new light, thy Saviour's hand shall open thine eyes, and in his light thou shalt see light; and thus shalt see, that though in the eyes of men thou lie upon that bed, as a Statue on a Tomb, yet in the eyes of God, thou standest as a Colossus, one foot in one, another in another land; one foot in the grave, but the other in heaven; one hand in the womb of the earth, and the other in Abraham's bosom: and then *vere prope*,

[1] 'Preached upon Easter Day, 1629,' 1, 24, p. 241.

salvation is truly near thee, and nearer than when thou believedst, which is our last word[1].

The last sentence of this passage suggests an aspect of death that was ever present to Donne's mind—Death as the Deliverer. To him life was but a gradual death, and death the gate to that which alone could truly be called life. He possessed in full measure the neurotic temperament which, though it experiences moments of the most exquisite bliss, yet too often finds life an intolerable burden. In the *Anatomy of the World* (First Anniversary, ll. 91–94), he had declared:

> There is no health; physicians say that we,
> At best, enjoy but a neutrality.
> And can there be worse sickness than to know
> That we are never well, nor can be so?

and in the Sermon preached on Easter Day, 1627, he spoke of himself as 'a volume of diseases bound up together[2].'

In the Sermon preached on Christmas Day, 1626, there is a significant passage:

> My body is my prison; and I would be so obedient to the Law, as not to break prison; I would not hasten my death by starving, or macerating this body: But if this prison be burnt down with continual fevers, or blown down with continual vapours, would any man be so in love with that ground upon which that prison stood, as to desire rather to stay there, than to go home[3].

We know from *Biathanatos* that Donne had often contemplated the possibility of suicide[4], and in that work he had tried to demonstrate 'that Self-Homicide is not so naturally sin that it may never be otherwise.' *Biathanatos* was written, however, comparatively early, and it is clear from passages in the Divine Poems and the Sermons, that in later life Donne decided that, however desirable death might be, a man was not justified in inflicting it upon himself.

In the 'Litany' he prays to Christ:

> And since Thou so desirously
> Didst long to die, that long before Thou couldst,
> And long since Thou no more couldst die,
> Thou in Thy scatter'd mystic body wouldst
> In Abel die, and ever since
> In Thine; let their blood come
> To beg for us a discreet patience
> Of death, or of worse life; for O, to some
> Not to be martyrs, is a martyrdom.

[1] III, 20, p. 295. (The numbering of the pages in Vol. III is inaccurate, and nos. 285–296 are used twice. This passage occurs on the earlier of the two pages numbered as 295.)

[2] I, 22, p. 223.

[3] I, 4, p. 38.

[4] 'Whensoever any affliction assails me, methinks I have the keys of my prison in mine own hand, and no remedy presents itself so soon to my heart, as mine own sword.' *Biathanatos*, p. 18.

And in the Sermon on Easter Day, 1624, he exhorts his hearers:

> If thou desire this first Resurrection in the third acceptation, as St Paul did, To be dissolved, and to be with Christ, go Christ's way to that also. He desired that glory that thou doest; and he could have laid down his soul when he would; but he staid his hour, says the Gospel....Thou hast no such power of thine own soul and life, not for the time, not for the means of coming to this first Resurrection by death; Stay therefore patiently, stay cheerfully God's leisure till he call; but not so over-cheerfully, as to be loath to go when he calls[1].

Yet this gloomy attitude towards the mysteries of life and death represents only one side of Donne's complex nature. In spite of his constitutional melancholy, there was in him an intense capacity for delight which shewed itself in the passion of his love-poems, and is still evident in the later prose works; but whereas Love and Death had been the themes of his earlier work, the order is now rather Death and Love. Death has become the gate of Life, the way that leads to the goal of all desire. Like Sidney, Donne has bidden farewell to the love that reacheth but to dust, and has welcomed instead the eternal love that cannot change nor die. The passion remains, but it is purified and exalted.

> Bring therefore your Ambition to that bent, to covet a place in the kingdom of heaven, bring your anger to flow into zeal, bring your love to enamour you of that face, which is fairer than the children of men, that face, on which the Angels desire to look, Christ Jesus[2].

Love is not despised; it is 'the richest mantle, the noblest affection, that the nature of man hath[3],' but it cannot find satisfaction in the things of space and time. He recalls the old joys of earthly passion and finds them too transitory.

> They are joys that come seldom, and stay but a little while when they come. Call it joy, to have had that thou lovest, in thine eye, or in thy arms, remember what oaths, what false oaths, it did cost thee before it came to that! And where is that joy now, is there a *semper* in that? Call it joy to have had him whom thou hatest, in thine hands or under thy feet, what ignoble disguises to that man, what servile observations of some greater, than either you, or he, did that cost you before you brought him into your power? and where is that joy, if a Funeral or a bloody conscience benight it?

And then he turns to the joy of the angelic host. 'To take away all wonder, it is added, the Lord is in the midst of them, and then, be what they will, they must rejoice; For if he be with them they are with him, and he is Joy[4].'

[1] I, 19, pp. 191, 192.
[2] 'Preached at St Paul's, 13 Oct. 1622,' II, 38, p. 352.
[3] 'Preached at Paul's Cross...March 24, 1616,' III, 24, p. 335.
[4] 'A Sermon preached in Saint Dunstan's,' II, 50, p. 472.

All love but the love of God 'admits satiety.' 'The highest degree of other love is the love of woman: which love, when it is rightly placed upon one woman, it is dignified by the Apostle with the highest comparison, Husbands love your wives, as Christ loved his Church[1].' Yet even this love finds disappointment. 'The sphere of our loves is sublunary, upon things naturally inferior to ourselves[2].' Donne had sung often of the fleeting nature of earthly love; neither in woman, nor in himself, had he hoped to find constancy. He had found it at last in his wife, but death had taken her from him. Now he yearns for a love that shall never lose its object.

> Even love itself, as noble a passion as it is, is but a pain, except we enjoy that we love; and therefore another branch of the School, with their Aureolus, place this blessedness, this union of our souls with God, *in gaudio*, in our joy, that is, in our enjoying of God. In this world we enjoy nothing; enjoying presumes perpetuity; and here, all things are fluid, transitory: There I shall enjoy, and possess for ever, God himself[3].

He who sees, even from afar, the light of this glory, cannot live wholly in darkness, and thus Donne insists that the joys of heaven must begin already on earth.

> Man passes not from the miseries of this life, to the joys of Heaven, but by joy in this life too; for he that feels no joy here, shall find none hereafter[4].
>
> The brightest noon had a faint twilight, and break of day; the sight of God which we shall have in heaven, must have a *Diluculum*, a break of day here; if we will see his face there, we must see it in some beams here[5].

And the vision brings not only joy, but also purification; as ever, he that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself even as also He is pure; and thus we find Donne preaching from two texts that must have sounded somewhat strange from his lips: 'Rejoice evermore,' and 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' The two ideas are united in a noble passage in the sermon that has just been quoted:

> The pure in heart are blessed already, not only comparatively, that they are in a better way of Blessedness, than others are, but actually in a present possession of it: for this world and the next world, are not to the pure in heart two houses, but two rooms, a Gallery to pass through, and a Lodging to rest in, in the same House, which are both under one roof, Christ Jesus; the Militant and the Triumphant are not two Churches, but this the Porch, and that the Chancel of the same Church, which are under one Head, Christ Jesus; so the Joy, and the sense of Salvation, which the pure in heart have here, is not a joy severed from the Joy of Heaven, but a Joy that begins in us here, and continues, and accompanies us thither, and there

[1] 'Preached at Paul's Cross...March 24, 1616,' III, 24, p. 336.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 337.
[3] 'Preached at St Paul's Cross, November 22, 1629,' II, 44, p. 421.
[4] 'Preached in St Dunstan's,' II, 50, p. 466.
[5] 'Preached on Candlemas Day,' I, 12, p. 122.

flows on, and dilutes itself to an infinite expansion...though the fulness of the glory thereof be reserved to that which is expressed in the last branch, *Videbunt Deum*, They shall see God[1].

Donne had long desired that final consummation, when 'God's great Venite' should 'change the song.' In the *Anatomy of the World* he had cried:

> Thirst for that time, O my insatiate soul,
> And serve thy thirst with God's safe-sealing bowl;
> Be thirsty still, and drink still till thou go
> To th' only health,

but as he grows older there flames higher in him the love that shall find full satisfaction only in that Beatific Vision for which his whole soul yearns with unquenchable desire. Again and again he turns to this theme, but words fail him as he approaches it.

To this light of glory, the light of honour is but a glow-worm; and majesty itself but a twilight; the Cherubims and Seraphims are but Candles; and that Gospel itself, which the Apostle calls the glorious Gospel, but a Star of the least magnitude. And if I cannot tell, what to call this light, by which I shall see it, what shall I call that which I shall see by it, The Essence of God himself[2]?

It is time to end; but as long as the glass hath a gasp, as long as I have one, I would breathe in this air, in this perfume, in this breath of heaven, the contemplation of this Joy....Joy in this life...is called meat...Joy in the next life...is called drink...but the overflowing, the *Ebrietas animae*, that is reserved to the last time, when our bodies as well as our souls, shall enter into the participation of it; Where, when we shall love everyone, as well as our selves, and so have that Joy of our own salvation multiplied by that number, we shall have that Joy so many times over, as there shall be souls saved, because we love them as our selves, how infinitely shall this Joy be enlarged in loving God, so far above our selves, and all them[3].

Blessedness itself, is God himself; our blessedness is our possession, our union with God[4].

EVELYN M. SPEARING.

CAMBRIDGE.

[1] 'Preached on Candlemas Day,' I, 12, p. 119.
[2] 'Preached at St Paul's for Easter Day, 1628,' I, 23, p. 231.
[3] 'Preached in St Dunstan's,' II, 50, pp. 473, 474.
[4] 'Preached at St Paul's Cross, Nov. 22, 1629,' II, 44, p. 421.

SHELLEY'S *ZASTROZZI* AND *ST IRVYNE*.

THE long disregarded romances of Shelley come under a new light in Dr A. H. Koszul's brilliant book, *La Jeunesse de Shelley* (Paris, 1910), which shows how much they foreshadow of the poet's later self—his bias for the extremes of energy, sensibility, and passion, his heresy and mysticism. In the *Revue Germanique* for March, 1905 the same scholar indicates the main source of the novels in Mrs Byrne's *Zofloya or The Moor*, as well as some minor influence from Regnault-Warin's *La Caverne de Strozzi* (Paris, 1798). To this secondary source I would add others. Whatever other models Mrs Byrne used, her main motives had been suggested in two romances by English forerunners, and Shelley had these in mind. Moreover *St Irvyne* can only be construed if we take into consideration also Godwin's *St Leon*.

In 1795 Lewis's *Ambrosio, or The Monk*[1] brought in 'the intense school' of Gothic fiction with its sexual passion, bloodshed, and demonology. Ambrosio, an Abbot of Madrid, is tempted by a demon in woman's form. Before he yields there is a long spell of fencing between his conscience and his temptress (Matilda). (1) She has him bitten by a serpent, and as he lies on the sick bed, seemingly, but not really, asleep, bends over him and gives utterance to her passion (I, ii, 3 vol. edition, 1798). She nurses him untiringly, and then, sickening with poison sucked from his wound, refuses to employ a remedy she knows of unless she may be his mistress; and he consents. (2) His next sin is to cast eyes of desire on the gentle and innocent Antonia, a maiden of Madrid. But Antonia is well guarded by her mother, and by Matilda's advice the Abbot asks aid of the Devil, who is summoned by gruesome rites in an underground cave (II, 259 ff.). Condemned to death by the Inquisition, the terrors of which are deployed at length (III, 271 f.), Ambrosio muses on God, immortality, and the forgiveness of sins; assents to these mysteries, but can only despair (III, 278, 279). Matilda,

[1] The relation of *Zastrozzi* to *The Monk* was pointed out by Mr A. B. Young in the *Modern Language Review*, vol. I, pp. 322 f.

entering the cell supernaturally, induces him to sign away his soul to the Devil; who then enters, whisks him to the brink of a precipice, and tumbles him into the abyss. The Devil at his appearance is accompanied by 'a strain of sweet but solemn music' (II, 197). Before securing Ambrosio's soul he is a beautiful youth (II, 273); after securing it he wears a form of terrible ugliness.

(3) In 1797 Mrs Radcliffe's *The Italian* added another figure to the Gothic gallery—the masterly plotter and murderer, Schedoni. A nobleman born, he enters a monastery after a youth of crime; and there, haughty, taciturn, austere, inspires his fellows with fear and curiosity. He had a lined face and piercing eyes; 'in his air as he stalked along wrapt in the black garments of his order there was something terrible, something almost superhuman.' A noble youth (Vivaldi) seeks in marriage a plebeian maiden (Ellena). His mother, the Marchesa di Vivaldi, determines to part them, and takes counsel of Schedoni, her confessor. Thereupon plot and counterplot; Schedoni (his action is hardly motived) standing at the Marchesa's side, spurring her even to murder, stilling her conscience, and executing her resolves.

The critical moment comes when, in the act to murder Ellena in her sleep, he is arrested by her beauty, sees his own portrait on her breast, and takes her for his own child. He too perishes in the Inquisition, the scenery of which is given in the author's lavish manner. (4) One more character is of moment to us—the ghost-like monk, who appears now and then to utter a warning voice, only to vanish with a super-human facility that eludes all pursuit.

Mrs Byrne wrote also under the names of 'Rosa Matilda' and 'Charlotte Dacre.' One of her romances is *The Nun of St Omer's*, and another in four volumes *The Passions*. In 1805 she published *Hours of Solitude*, two volumes of verse in the vein of Lewis. According to her portrait in this book she was a rather young lady, an impression which her writings do not disturb. In 1806 she published through Longman *Zofloya or The Moor*, described as 'a Romance of the fifteenth century, in three volumes, by Charlotte Dacre, better known as Rosa Matilda[1].' Medwin (I, 30, 31) after mentioning *The Italian* as a favourite work of Shelley's youth says that *Zofloya* 'quite enraptured' him and that it became the source for his two romances.

[1] There is no copy either in the British Museum, in the University Libraries of Cambridge or Edinburgh, or in the Advocates' Library, nor is it mentioned in the purview of the 'Auskunftsbureau der Deutschen Bibliotheken.' After reading in the British Museum a French translation in four volumes by a Madame de Viterne, Paris 1812, I found that the English original was in the Bodleian. As I was then at a distance from Oxford, Mrs Sidney Ball undertook with great kindness to verify my references.

The plot of *Zofloya* has affinities with both *The Monk* and *The Italian*. Victoria di Loredani, the heroine, is a Matilda amerced of demonic qualities. She is of a noble house in Venice; her father dies early; and her mother, who was a faithless wife, brings her up in a frivolous society. The girl was a beauty of the dark and imperious type; 'the wildest passions predominated in her bosom; to gratify them she possessed an unshrinking relentless soul that would not startle at the darkest crime' (I, x, 219). These passions impel her into crimes, in which, like the Marchesa di Vivaldi, she is assisted by a mysterious and commanding personality. But Zofloya the Moor differs, both apparently and essentially, from Schedoni; for Zofloya is the Devil himself manipulating the damnation of a soul, no longer acting through a subordinate, as in *The Monk*. The theme of a woman tempting a man is treated in two variations, and the contrast drawn by Lewis between an angelic and a brazen woman is sharpened by the matching of these types in love. The action falls into four parts:

(*a*) (5) Victoria engages the rich Count Berenza to make her his mistress and afterwards his wife. Berenza has already betrayed his affection for her when she boldly throws herself on his protection. He lodges her in his palace, but, wishing to prove her nature, treats her only as a sister or friend; and she draws him on by stratagems like those of Lewis's Matilda—by a melting melancholy, and by sighing forth an avowal of her passion in apparent sleep, while he is bending over her. As if still in sleep she starts forward to embrace him, opens her eyes, and exhibits a captivating shame (I, 228, 229). (6) After becoming Berenza's mistress she is with him on the Canal one evening when a woman (a cast-off favourite of his) darts murderous glances at her from a passing gondola. Soon after, an assassin attempts the Count's life as he is sleeping in his bed. Victoria intercepts the blow, incurring a slight wound, and so improves the occasion that Berenza marries her (I, xi).

(*b*) (7) Episode of Victoria's brother, Leonardo (I, xii f.). In the escaping assassin she recognised her own brother. He was a youth with amiable qualities, but weakly passionate and proud. His shame at his mother's infidelity to her husband drove him to disappear from Venice and his friends. In his wanderings he comes to the cottage of an old woman, just bereft of an only son who had tilled her garden and worked at it beyond his strength. Leonardo takes the son's place and tills the garden until the woman dies (II, xiii). (8) Returning to Venice, he becomes the favourite lover of Megalena Strozzi, Berenza's former mistress. One day Megalena finds him caressing another woman; she leads him home with the air of a fury; her dour silence reduces him to penitence, but he must purchase pardon by consenting to murder the new temptress (II, xiv, 42 f.). At Megalena's word he tries to assassinate Berenza; after which the guilty couple leave Venice in fear of detection.

(*c*) (9) Victoria falls in love with her brother-in-law, Henriquez, and is abetted by his Moorish servant, Zofloya. Henriquez is devoted to Lilla, a noble maiden with a seraphic face and a primitive innocence; but she is under a vow not to marry for a year, and they must wait out the time. She, her aged aunt, and Henriquez become members of Berenza's household. (10) Zofloya attracts Victoria by his majestic stature and extreme beauty, and haunts her dreams. She dreams that he asks her if she will belong to him at the moment when Henriquez is leading Lilla to the altar. 'Oh yes, yes!' she cries, whereupon Lilla becomes a spectre, and she herself takes the hand of Henriquez, only to see him turn to a skeleton (II, xvii, 113, 114). In the nights she feels that Zofloya is near her in the room; she sees his form and calls to it, but it vanishes. At length he seeks occasion to

speak, and offers to help her to win Henriquez and destroy her husband (II, xix). He gives her a slow poison which she administers to Berenza. (11) The household is moved to a chateau in the Apennines, on the skirts of a forest, where only the cataract or the bell and organ of a convent break the quietness (II, xxii, 199 f.). Victoria frequently meets her counsellor in the forest depths. He appears noiselessly and like a breath of wind; sometimes preceded by flute-like tones (II, xxiv, 239; cf. *The Monk*); he will stand suddenly before her when she has just left him far behind; once, in the flashes of a storm, she sees him like a spirit 'now emerging from among the trees, now scaling the pointed rock, and now appearing a figure of fire upon its lofty summit' (III, xviii, 74). He seems to come unbidden when she needs him most; and with him her spirit is at peace as without him it is racked with passion (II, xxiv). He pacifies her conscience by deriding right and wrong as scholastic inanities (II, xx, 171); checks her impatience at the slowness of the poison or any sign of mistrust by glances which she cannot meet; but allows her to try the drug on Lilla's aunt, who expires in convulsions at her feet (II, xxiii, 230 f.). (12) Berenza having died, she asks Zofloya to put Lilla also out of the way. For Henriquez does not conceal his repugnance to her brazen nature. When she caressed Lilla 'he almost trembled for her tender life and compared the picture in his mind to the snowy dove fondled by the ravenous vulture.' When Victoria avows her passion he sternly upbraids her, and declares that his devotion to Lilla is unalterable (III, xxvi). (13) Zofloya now carries off Lilla from the chateau, and confines her in an underground cave, bound to the wall with a chain; brings her food and drink daily, but without replying to her entreaties (III, xxvii, xxviii). (14) Maddened by her loss, Henriquez falls into a delirious fever, and is nursed by Victoria, who will not perceive the patient's loathing of her presence (III, xxviii, 51 f.). When she entreats his love and tells him Lilla is dead, he vows eternal fidelity to her memory, and swoons away. On recovery, finding his head on Victoria's breast, he starts aside as if from a serpent. Thereupon she seeks Zofloya in a terrible storm in the forest, and obtains a drug which will cause Henriquez to imagine she is Lilla and take her to his arms. The drug has its effect; a banquet is spread, music is played; in mad transport she dances with Henriquez until, tired with wine and pleasure, they retire to rest (III, xxviii, 71—87). On awaking and discovering the illusion he plunges a sword into his breast. (15) Victoria hurries to Lilla's prison, drags her forth by the hair, and, foiling her attempts to escape, stabs her body in innumerable places (III, xxix).

(*d*) (16) Victoria gives her soul to the Moor. Zofloya now spirits his victim to an Alpine solitude, where they are taken by brigands to a cavern in the heart of a mountain. Robbers are seated there at their feast; the newcomers are welcomed. Zofloya accompanies the brigands in their expeditions and with him all their enterprizes prosper; they admire and fear him, for he is an enigma (III, xxx, xxxi). The Robber Chief and a woman living with him—she has a strange manner, and has lost her youth and beauty—behave to Victoria, the one with reserve, the other with hostility. They are discovered to be Leonardo and Megalena. The good-hearted Leonardo is contrasted with Victoria through the behaviour of each towards their mother, who is captured by the brigands and dies in the cavern. (17) The stronghold is betrayed to the military by a brigand named Ginotti; Leonardo and Megalena take their own lives. Victoria and Zofloya are surrounded by soldiers in the cavern, when it is shaken by an earthquake, and Zofloya escapes with her to the brink of a precipice. Since the death of Henriquez she has felt a tenderness for the Moor, and has frequently offered him her body and soul. And now, having caused her to repeat the assurance of self-surrender, he is changed before her eyes from beauty to hideousness; announcing in a terrific voice that he is Satan, he throws her from the steep, and her soul is received into hell (III, xxxiii).

(18) William Godwin's *St Leon* (1799) was a favourite book with Shelley (Medwin, I, 70), and he named it to Stockdale as a source of *St Irvyne* (Nov. 19, 1810). St Leon is a French nobleman, ruined

by extravagance and living with his family in a peasant's condition. An old man presents himself to him and says:—'The only thing I have to do in the world is to die. I seek a friend who will take care that I die in peace. Shall I trust you?' Before he can die he must impart a secret to one who will not disclose it, he must transfer to another certain powers of which he longs to be rid. The secret and the powers consist of the elixir of life, which he transfers to St Leon and dies (ch. xi—xiii). The elixir is made up of syrups and essences according to a prescription (ch. xxxiii).

Zastrozzi also presents us with the superman as criminal, as controlling an intrigue in which his employer is his dupe. Gothic writers found a thrilling virtue in the letter *z*, and by a syllable added to the Strozzi of *Zofloya* the hero has three to his name. He is a highwayman who, for a wrong done to his mother, pursues a relentless vengeance against the wrongdoer's son, Verezzi (the name occurs in *The Mysteries of Udolpho*). Matilda di Laurentini, a replica of Mrs Byrne's Victoria, is fiercely enamoured of Verezzi, who repulses her. As in *Zofloya*, the bold seductress is contrasted with the heavenly Countess Julia whom Verezzi loves. Zastrozzi becomes Matilda's accomplice and pretends to seek occasion to assassinate her rival; but he wishes only that Verezzi may yield to the temptress, forswear Julia, and lose his soul. The supernatural element is pared away; the hero, like Schedoni, is a disposer of events, but human. I will mark the phases of the action and the incidents clearly due to the adduced sources. The parenthetic numbers refer to the numbers given in parentheses above; the page citations to vol. I of Shelley's Prose Works, ed. Shepherd, 1897.

Ch. I: Verezzi confined by Zastrozzi in an underground cave (13). Ch. II: The cave shattered by lightning (17). Ch. III: Verezzi sheltered by the old woman whose garden he tills in place of her dead son (7). Ch. V: Matilda induces him to reside at her house; he cannot return her passion and contrasts her bold nature and commanding figure with his delicate Julia (12). She affects melancholy (5), and asks pardon for avowing her love. Ch. VI: She tells him that Julia is dead; he faints. Ch. VII: Wakes to find his head on Matilda's breast, and starts away as from a scorpion. Is nursed through a fever by Matilda, in spite of his manifest disgust and vows of fidelity to Julia (1, 12, 14). Ch. X: The chateau in the mountains (11, cf. p. 86, the bells and requiem from the convent, and the evening requiem in *The Italian*, ch. II). Ch. XII: Stratagem by which Verezzi is attacked by the disguised Zastrozzi and Matilda slightly wounded in

his defence (1, 6). She dreams Verezzi becomes a spectre as she gives him her hand at the altar (10). Ch. XIII: Verezzi overhears her lamenting his cruelty and clasps her to his breast, she pretending shame and surprise (1, 5). The bridal feast, music, and wild dance (14). All this time Matilda is impatient for the murder of Julia. Ch. IV: Zastrozzi rebukes her mistrust of him; proves his poisons on a hapless prisoner. Ch. IX: He argues with her conscience. Ch. XII: He constantly holds counsel with her in the forest by the chateau. His majestic appearance in a storm (11, 14). Ch. XIV: Verezzi being now forsworn, Zastrozzi inveigles the pair to Venice, where Matilda sees Julia in a passing gondola and eyes her like a basilisk (6). Ch. XV: Verezzi, overcome at seeing his lost love, hurried home by Matilda, who stirs his heart by reproachful silence (8). Julia enters the room, and in despair he stabs himself (14). Matilda murders Julia (15). Matilda's repentance and comforting vision in the prison of the Inquisition (2). Zastrozzi dies under torture, his vengeance fulfilled.

St Irvyne uses up the supernatural element from Mrs Byrne's book which was left out of *Zastrozzi*, and adds the motive of the *elixir vitae* from *St Leon*. The hero, Ginotti (17), has the gigantic stature and terrible eyes, the mysterious authority and reserve of Zofloya. As a young student he had denied God, devoted himself to the Devil, and discovered and tasted the elixir (ch. X, compare the twofold appearance of the devil first in beauty and then in ugliness, and the concomitant strain of music with 2, 11, 17). In the story he pursues a double end; as cursed with the elixir, he haunts a man to whom he will impart the secret, and so earn his own death; and as an infernal agent he corrupts an innocent girl.

(*a*) Wolfstein, whom he destines for the elixir, is a nobleman's son who has left home and joined a band of robbers in the Alps (the brigands' cavern, the feast, the sullen woman at the Chief's side, and Wolfstein's ascendancy over the brigands, all agreeing with 16). Ginotti, who is one of these robbers, aids Wolfstein to escape from their stronghold with the lovely captive Megalena (8). The lovers go to Genoa and lead a dissipated life. Episode of Olympia's passion for Wolfstein. Megalena discovers them together; and by her reproachful silence makes Wolfstein promise to murder her rival (8). Scene in Olympia's chamber; Wolfstein's arm arrested by her beauty (3). Ginotti frequently appears to Wolfstein in a ghostlike way (4, 11). He tells him that, having control of all his thoughts and actions (11), he is preparing him to receive a secret (ch. VIII). He makes him promise to

listen to this secret when the time for telling it comes and 'suffer his soul to rest in annihilation' (18). At the destined hour he gives him the prescription for the elixir (ch. x), and appoints him a meeting at the ruined Abbey by St Irvyne. There at dead of night Ginotti asks Wolfstein to deny God, which he refuses to do. The Devil appears, and they both fall dead as if blasted by fire. But Ginotti, though through the transference of the secret he dies in the flesh, must endure in hell the everlasting life he had sought by unlawful means. Shelley informed Stockdale (Nov. 14, 1810) that both the victims of this obscure scene perished by the elixir, and not by the blast of the Devil. It seems, then, that the effect of the drug depends on the recipient's belief in God. Wolfstein believes, and is saved from a lawless immortality; but we are not told what becomes of his soul.

(*b*) The tale of Eloise and her woes is inserted into the foregoing story (ch. vii, ix, xi, xii), but so that there is no apparent connection between the two trains of incident. At the beginning of the sub-plot in ch. vii, Eloise returns ruined and destitute to her home, St Irvyne's Castle, which she had left six years before. The story is to tell of her misfortunes. But in the sequel she is blissfully married and does not return home at all. She accompanies a dying mother from St Irvyne to Geneva, and meets a mysterious and fascinating stranger (Nempere) in a lonely house at which they are forced to lodge by the way (cf. *Mysteries of Udolpho*, vi, vii). After her mother's death Nempere first seduces Eloise, and then sells her to an English nobleman, who treats her with respect. At the nobleman's house she meets Fitzeustace, a beautiful soul, and falls in love with him. The crisis of the affair is brought about by his hearing her murmur a confession of her love in sleep (1, 5; and *The Italian*, ch. ii). The nobleman kills Nempere in a duel, and flees to England, whither the now married lovers follow him. In the last lines of the book we have this curt intimation:—'Nempere is Ginotti, Eloise is the sister of Wolfstein.' Now if Ginotti is Nempere, then he dies twice, once when the nobleman killed him, and afterwards from the elixir at St Irvyne's. Stockdale pointed this out, and Shelley answered (Nov. 19, 1810): 'You will perceive that Mountfort physically did kill Ginotti, which must appear from the latter's paleness'; which leaves us still wondering. The fact is, one form cannot contain the two natures in Ginotti. As a demon, presiding over souls and free of physical laws, he can die as often as Shelley chooses; as the man out of *St Leon*, only once. Shelley was trying to compound two series of marvels. But before reducing his book to rhyme and reason he wearied

of it, and sent the draft to Stockdale as it stood. Stockdale improved it a little[1], but the two strands of the story remain hanging asunder. It seems that Wolfstein is a replica of Leonardo in *Zofloya*. Wolfstein, we are told, left his home under circumstances which attached no guilt to himself but precluded his return (pp. 120, 133). This was also Leonardo's case, and both young men were sinful yet redeemable souls. As in *Zofloya* brother and sister meet at the end after many vicissitudes, so, it appears from the opening of chapter VII, the outcast Eloise was to have rejoined her brother at St Irvyne's, where they would have confronted Ginotti together and perished with him; they two perishing, however, with an assurance of salvation through faith and repentance. But then Fitzeustace intervened to take Eloise to England, and the tale fell to pieces. Perhaps Shelley became immersed all at once in the subject of free love, and changed the plot that he might the better expound his mind. I will give a reason presently for this conjecture.

So much of Shelley's incident is from Mrs Byrne that he does little but deal her cards afresh. In a few instances he paraphrases his models pretty closely, and these instances exhibit the difference between his style and theirs in fulness and portentous fervour. As thus:—*The Monk* (I, 156): 'Tremble, Ambrosio, the first step is taken, and he who breaks his faith with heaven will soon break it with man...Hark! 'twas the shriek of your better angel; he flees and leaves you for ever.' *St Irvyne* (ch. VII): 'But hush! what was that scream which was heard by the ear of listening enthusiasm? It was the shriek of the fair Eloise's better genius; it screamed to see the foe of the innocent girl so near—it is fled fast to Geneva. There, Eloise, will we meet again, methought it whispered, whilst a low hollow tone, hoarse from the dank vapours of the grave, seemed lowly to howl in the ear of rapt fancy, We meet again likewise.' In fact the only charm in the two novels is the author's sincere enjoyment of them. M. Koszul has noted Shelley's carelessness of mere narrative and his attention to dramatic incidents or to situations of horror or psychical stress. We may observe that he elaborates beyond his models the terrors of Verezzi's underground prison (*Zastr.* ch. I; the delirium and the crawling worms are his addition); the agony of a dangerous illness (*Zastr.* ch. VI); and especially the erotic tension and tumult between Verezzi and Matilda, in which, remarkably enough, there is more energy and detail than in Lewis or Mrs Byrne. He twice reproduces the incident of a mistress finding her

[1] 'I return the Romance...I am much obligated by the trouble you have taken to fit it for the press' (Letter to Stockdale, Nov. 14, 1810).

lover in dalliance with a rival and quelling him with silent reproach, and that again of a lover surprising his beloved in the avowal of her passion. The Alpine landscapes owed their features to the Gothic tradition, but his own mind was at work in the choice of those vivid marks of the mystery of life and death, familiar afterwards in his poetry —the sole scathed larch on the mountain-side or the thin grasses in the chinks of a castle wall[1]. Shelley's Alps, lurid as a coloured poster, are yet the first essays of a special sense for grandeur and energy, just as Zastrozzi and Ginotti are the infant brethren of Cenci.

In two letters to Godwin (Jan. 10 and March 8, 1812) Shelley says that he was 'in a state of intellectual sickness' when he wrote the novels, and that *Political Justice* suddenly and completely healed him. 'I was no longer the votary of romance; till then I had existed in an ideal world—now I found that in this universe of ours was enough to excite the interest of the heart, enough to employ the discussions of reason.' Is there external evidence for a sudden change from the romantic to the practical or speculative interest? I think, yes. *Zastrozzi* was 'in great part written by May of the year 1809' (Dowden I, 46). In the summer of 1810 Shelley left Eton; in December *St Irvyne* came out. A letter to Graham of April 1, 1810, proves that the romance was finished, or nearly so, by that date. Besides the novels *The Wandering Jew* is of a Gothic nature; in all probability Shelley composed it with Medwin at Christmas 1809–1810 (Dowden I, 44). In the *Original Poetry by Victor and Cazire* the Gothic pieces, besides the plagiarised *Eve of St Edmond*, are *Revenge* and *Ghasta*, and both are dated from those same Christmas weeks. The pieces dated from the ensuing summer are mostly of an elegiac kind and have no features of mystery or terror. There remains only *The Spectral Horseman* in the Margaret Nicholson poems, and that may have been composed at any time. There is a check to the romantic interest, therefore, after April 1810[2]. *St Irvyne* points the same way. Both the novels are full of the

[1] Cf., for instance, the moonlit scene in *Zastr.* ch. x with *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, ch. IV. The Alpine storm in the beginning of *St Irvyne* owes something to *Udolpho*, ch. L, and *St Leon*, ch. VII, where the lightning 'dancing on the top of the rocks' caught Shelley's fancy (p. 117); the figure of the 'long-protracted war echoing from cavern to cavern' (p. 115) remained in his mind to be splendidly rendered in *Prince Athanase*, 69—72. M. Koszul has noted the frequent appearance of the solitary pine (pp. 58, 121, 181), and compares *Queen Mab*, VII, 259, *Laon and Cythna*, VI, 10. For the grasses (p. 22) cf. *Udolpho* ch. XIX, *Rosalind and Helen* 823, *Julian and Maddalo* 224.

[2] The conversations with Hogg at Oxford are throughout of a speculative nature. But that romance was not banished from Shelley's mind we may argue from the fact that Medwin found him at College with a manuscript book of romances, and from Hogg's statement (ch. XXVIII) that after Eton Shelley 'had usually some tale on the anvil.' As to *Political Justice* Hogg somewhere suggests that Shelley read it at the house of

romancers' philosophic tags—discourses about morality, education, God, the future life. But free love, which is but briefly mentioned in *Zofloya* (ch. v) and only touched upon by a line in *Zastrozzi* (ch. xiii, p. 80), becomes in *St Irvyne* a theme for discussion (ch. ix, xii). May not the interest in this subject have come from *Political Justice* falling into Shelley's hands when he was half way through with his second romance? And may not the poor finishing of *St Irvyne* be due to the disturbance induced by the new influence? This leaning to speculation and science marks a period in Shelley's life, until imagination claimed its own again, feebly in *Queen Mab*, victoriously in *Alastor*.

A. M. D. Hughes.

Kiel.

Dr Lind; and Shelley told Godwin in January 1812, that he had first met with it more than two years before that date.

THE GENITIVE SUFFIX IN THE FIRST ELEMENT OF ENGLISH PLACE-NAMES.

THE following investigation is based mainly on material which I have collected for a work on the Place-Names of Oxfordshire. The idea of an article of this nature and scope is due to a suggestion of Professor Wyld, who has also kindly furnished me with some supplementary material drawn from his book on *The Place-Names of Lancashire*. In ascertaining whether any principle is at work in the development of the genitive suffix in Place-Names, there are two main classes of names to be considered—those of the strong, and those of the weak, declension. Generally speaking it is normal for the names of the strong declension to retain their genitive suffix (*s*), though, as we shall see, there are numerous cases in which it is lost.

In the case of weak names, however, it would appear that, except under certain conditions, the *-an* of the genitive case normally disappears.

The material is arranged under five different heads—A. *Strong Personal Names*, which are divided into two classes:—(1) those which retain the genitive, and (2) those which lose it; B. *Weak Personal Names*, which fall into three classes:—(1) those which lose the genitive suffix; (2) those which retain it as *n* throughout their career; (3) those which change the genitive *-an* into *-in*, *-en* or *-ing*.

There is also a list of examples of the interchange of strong and weak suffixes in the same Place-Names.

A (1). *Strong names which retain the genitive suffix from earliest known form till present day.*

MODERN NAME	CONJECTURAL O.E. FORMS	EARLY FORMS
Alvescot	*Ælfhēahes cott	*Elfegescote*, D. B. 160 b.
Ambrosden	*Amb(e)res or Eanbeorhtes denn	*Ambresdene*, D. B. 157 b.
Balscote	*Bælles cotan	1204 *Belescote*, Obl. Rlls 231.
Bloxham	*Bloces hām	1142–8 *Blocchesham*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 52.

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Chawsey	*Cealfes īeg	1274–9 *Chalmesleye* (for *Chalveseye*), Rot. Hund. II, 713.
Chilson	*Cildes tūn	1291 *Childestone*, Tax. Eccl. 45.
Cuddesdon	*Cūþwines dūn	956 ? *Cuþenes dūne*, Birch III, 123.
Cutslow	*Cūþes hlāwe	1004 *Cudeslawe*, C. D. III, 328.
Cuxham	*Cuces hamm	995 *Cuces hamme*, C. D. III, 289.
Dunsdon	*Dunes denn	1274–9 *Dunesdene*, Rot. Hund. II, 38.
Eynsham	*Ægenes hām	1163 *Egeneshā*, Pipe Rolls VI, 49.
Gangsdown	*Gangwulfes	1231 *Gangulvesden*, Cl. Rlls (1231–4) H. III, p. 13.
Grimsbury	*(æt) Grimes byrig	No forms.
Ipsden	*Ippes denn	1274–9 *Yppesden*, Rot. Hund. I, 42 etc.
Kelmscott	*Cynehelmes (Cylmes) cott	1274–9 *Kelmescote*, Rot. Hund. II, 695.
Kingsey	*Cyninges īeg	1267 *Kingeseye*, Cal. Ch. Rlls (1257–1300) II, 71.
Kingston	*Cyninges tūn	1274–9 *Kingeston*, Rot. Hund. II, 786.
Madmarston	*Mæþmæres tūn	No forms.
Sarsden	*Serces denn	1152–70 *Sercesd(ene)*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 112.
Shellswell	*Scealdes wiella	1299 *Shaldeswell*, Cal. Ch. Rlls II, 481 (1257–1300).
Spelsbury	*Spel(l)es byrig	1200– *Spellesbur'*, Testa de N. 102, 113.
Stonesfield	*Stuntes feld	1200– *Stuntesfeld*, Testa de N. 107.
Tetsworth	*Tettes wyrth	1200– *Tetteswrth*, Testa de N. 120.
Tilgersley	*Tilgeardes lēah	1274–9 *Tilgardesle*, Rot. Hund. II, 859.
Tusmore	*Thōres mere	1200– *Thuresm'e*, Testa d. N. 101, 4.
Williamscot	*Wilhelmescott	1284–5 *Wilhamescote*, Feud. Aids IV, 156.
Woolaston	*Wīglāfes tūn	1267 *Wilavestona*, Cal. Ch. Rlls II, 69 (1257–1300).
Worsham	*Wulfmæres hām	1240† *Wolmersham*, Reg. Godst. Nunn. II, 551.
Wroxton	*Wrocces stān	1086 *Werochestan*, D. B. 159 b.

There is no need to add instances outside Oxfordshire to illustrate this retention of *s*. It is obvious that in the majority of cases the strong genitive *s* is retained. That this rule is not universal is shewn, however, by the following examples.

(2) *Cases where -s of strong genitive has been lost.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Alkerton	*Ælhheres tūn	1086 *Alcrintone*, D. B. 156. 1200 *Alkrinton*, Testa de N. 101. 1695 *Alkerington* Camden.

[In this name the loss of *-s* may be explained by the existence of two types, one containing the suffix *-ing*, the other containing the simple Personal Name *Ælhhere*, or else by a late metathesis and loss of *-ing*.]

Ardley	*Eardwulfes lēah	1086 *Ardulfeslie*, D. B. 157. 1200– *Ardulvele*, Testa de N. 101, 4. 1316 *Ardele*, Parl. Writs II, 353.

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Brighthampton	*Beorhthelmes tūn	1161 *Brihtelmeston*, Pipe Rlls IV, 9. 1274–9 *Brihtelminton* } Rot. Hund. II, *Brihtelme'ton* } 707. 1316 *Brighthelmeston*, Abbr. Plac. 324.
[Cf also *Brighton* (Sussex) which has the same etymology.]		
Rollright	*Hrōþlandes rīþ	1184 *Rollandrith*, Reg. Godst. Nunn. II, 532. 1307 *Rodlandrich* (*c* for *t*), Cal. Rot. Ch. 139. [No form in *-s* found.]
Tadmarton	*Thēodmǣres tūn or *Tatmǣres tūn	956 ? *Tadmœrtun*, C. D. II, 315 *Tademertūn*, II, 322. 1192 *Tadmarton*, Osn. Reg. 71. 1227–77 *Tademarton*, Non. Inq. 138.
[The etymology may, however, be *Tadan mere-tūn*—'the lake-town of *Tada*.']		
Wendlebury	*(æt) Wendeles byrig	1086 *Wandesberie*, D. B. 160. 1200– *Wendlebur'*, *Wendebur'*, Testa de N. 102, 117. 1274–9 *Wendlingbur'* } Rot. Hund. II, *Wendelbur'* } 45, 834.
Wolvercote	*(æt) Wulfgāres cotan	1086 *Ulfgarcote*, D. B. 159. 1149 *Wolgarcote*, Osn. Reg. 23. 1220 *Wolgoryscote*, *Walgarcote*, etc., Reg. Godst. Nunn. II, 574, 5. 1232 etc. *Wulgoricot*, etc., Cl. Rlls, Hy. III, 142 (1231–4).
[Out of 25 forms of this Place-Name which I have collected from various sources ranging from 1086 to 1695, only one (1220, above) has the genitive suffix in the first element.]		
Yelford	*Aegeles ford	1086 *Aieleforde*, D. B. 160. 1200– *Eleforde*, Testa de N. 102. 1245 *Eilesforde*, *Eillesford*, Cal. Ch. Rlls I, 285 (1226–57). 1535 *Elforde*, Val. Eccl. (Map).

To the foregoing examples may be added the following Lancashire names to illustrate the loss of *-s*.

Shuttleworth (*Suttelesworth* 1227).
Stainall (*Staynhole* 1200– no *s* forms).
Staynton (*Steynton* 1256).
Torboc (no *s* forms).
Thurstan Water (*Thurstaine* water 1196).
Turton (*Thurton* 1257– no *s* forms).
Winstanley (*Wynstanesligh* Lancashire Fines, I. 114).
Woolstenholme (*Wolftonesholme* 1290– form without *-s*—1332).

Cf. also **Liverpool** which Prof. Wyld has shown to be derived from *Lēofhere(s) pōl* and which has no form in *-s*, **Bartherton** (Cheshire) < *Beorhthere(s) tūn*, **Cholmundeley** (Cheshire) < *Ceolmunde(s) lēah* and many other names.

Causes of loss of -s.

It is thus obvious that a large number of Personal Names which are originally strong and take the genitive *-s* have lost this *-s* in the

modern name. Others show no sign of any *-s* suffix even in the oldest forms.

In the case of the latter class Professor Wyld has suggested that a usage without a genitive suffix may be due to the fact that the Personal Name was felt to be a sort of adjective qualifying the second element.

The cases where *-s*, once shewn, has disappeared in M.E. may be accounted for in different ways. We may note, in passing, that this disappearance is usually complete, i.e., no forms in *-s* are found by the first half of the thirteenth century.

(*a*) The *-s* tends to disappear when a syllable which contains it is lost. This is the case in Rollright, Ardley (above) and probably in Lancashire Aintree (*Ægenwulfes trēow*). Cf. also Brighton (Sussex) < *Beorhtelmestūn*.

(*b*) There may be two types; one with the Personal Name, the other with the suffix *-ing*, and contamination may take place. Besides Alkerton (above) this may have influenced the development of Brighthampton (cf. Brihthelminton), Wendlebury (cf. Wendlingbur').

(*c*) Analogy with other Place-Names may have an influence in causing the loss of *s*. Brighthampton is obviously influenced by the analogy of Place-Names compounded with O.E. *hām* or *ham(m)*, e.g., Hampton (O.E. *hăm(m)-tūn*), Chislehampton (O.E. *ceōsel + ham(m) + tūn*), Hampden (O.E. *hăm(m) + denn*), etc. Tadmarton (above) may have been influenced by Marton (O.E. *mere-tūn*), if the etymology *is* not actually *Tadan mere-tūn*, as suggested above.

(*d*) Finally it is possible that a large number of Place-Names, in which the first element originally was strong, have replaced the strong genitive by a weak suffix *-an*, which was normally lost, as will be seen later. To show the possibility of such an occurrence I have collected together cases of the interchange of strong and weak suffixes in early forms of the same name; in some of these examples the replacement has been permanent (see below, p. 71).

B. *The weak genitive in -an; its three-fold development.*

The cases investigated point to three possibilities in the development of the weak genitive suffix *-an*:—(1) it may be lost altogether; (2) it may be retained as *n*; (3) it may develop into *-en*, *-in* or *-ing*.

(1) Except before vowels and sometimes before *dūn* and *tūn* the weak genitive tends to disappear altogether.

The examples are the following:

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Bablock Hythe	*Babban lacu + hȳþ	1274–9 *Babbelak*, Rot. Hund. II, 733.
Baldon	*Bealdan dun	1274–9 *Baldendon*, Rot. Hund. II, 818. 1369 etc. *Baldyngdon*, St Frid's Ch. I, 236.
[Two types; (1) Baldendon, (2) Baldenton > (1) Baldedon > Baldon, (2) Baldington (1535). The type without *-ing* has survived.]		
Banbury	*(æt) Banan byrig	1239 *Bannebiry*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 4.
Beckley **Begbroke**	*Beccan {lēah {brōc	1149 *Bekeley*, Osn. Reg. 22. 1086 *Bechebroc*, D. B. 161.
Bicester	*Beornan ceaster	1086 *Bernecestre*, D. B. 158. 1200– *Burnecestre*, etc. Testa de N. 107.
Binfield	*Bynnan feld	1272–1377 *Benefeld*, Quo Warr. 669.
Cadwell	*Cadan wiella	1205 *Cadewell*, Obl. Rlls 335.
Chilworth	*Ceolan wyrth	1200– *Chelew'rth*, Testa de N. 100.
Copcourt	*Cuban cott	1316 *Copecote*, 1428 *Cobbecotes* } Feud. Aids, IV, 171, 192.
Cowley	*Cufan lēah	1199 *Cuveleia*, St Frid's Ch. I, 43.
Culham	*Culan hăm(m)	940? *Culan ham*, Birch II, 486. *Culen hēma*, *Culeham* } C. D. V, 264. 1200– *Culham*, Testa de N. 1274–9 *Colnham*, Rot. Hund. II, 852. 1482–91 *Culneham*, Mins. Accs. 336.
[Two types; one preserves *n* before second element beginning with aspirate (see under (2)); the other loses *n* early. The type without *n* has survived.]		
***Epwell**	*Eoppan wiella	956 *Eoppan wyllan*, C. D. III, 438. 1200– *Eppewelle*, Testa de N. 120.
Hanborough **Hanwell**	*Hana {byrig {wiella	1200– *Hanaber'*, Testa de N. 118. 1200– *Hanewell*, Testa de N. 113. *Hanywell*, Feud. Aids IV, 179.
Horley	*Hornan lēah	1200– *Hornele*, Testa de N. 103.
Idbury	*(æt) Idan byrig	1260 *Ydebury*, St Frid's Ch. II, 275.
Kidmore End	*Cyddan mōr	No forms.
Ledwell	*Lēodan wiella	*Ledewelle*, *Ludewelle* } D. B. 156 a.
Otmoor	*Otan mōr	No forms—but contiguous to **Oddington** which < *Otan dūn.*
Rofford	*Roppan ford	1086 *Ropeford*, D. B. 1606.
Sewell	*Syfan wiella	1086 *Sevewelle*, *Sivewelle* } D. B. 156 b, 157.
Shutford	*Scyttan ford	1254 *Shutteford*, Cal. Rol. Ch. 81 (fol.). 1390 *Shiteford*, Cal. I. P. M. III, 113.
Sibford	*Sibban ford	1200– *Sibeford*, *Sibbeford*, Testa de N. 100 etc.
Tackley	*Tæccan, *Tacan } lēah	1086 *Tachelie*, D. B. 157. 1176 *Taccheleia*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 97.
Thomley	*Tuman lēah	1086 *Tumbeleia*, D. B. 156 a. 1124–30 *Thumeleya*, St Frid's Ch. I, 14.
Wretchwick	*Wræccan wīc	1182 *Wrechewich*, 1299 *Wrecchewyk* } Index, p. 845.

These form the great majority of the cases where a weak Personal Name is the first element. In a few cases where the *-en* is retained it is probably due to the adjectival form *-en*, e.g., Brackenborough (Lincolnshire), etc.

The second class consists of Place-Names in which the *n* is retained before a second element which begins with a vowel or an aspirate, e.g., O.E. *ēā, īēg, ōfer, hofer, hyll, hȳþ*, etc.

(2) *Weak names which retain genitive -n as n.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Bolney	Bulan hȳþ	1227–77 *Bolehuthe*, Non. Inq. p. 136. 1428 *Bulnehith*, Feud. Aids IV, 200. 1466 *Bulnythe*, Cat. A. D. II, 514.
Bucknell	*Buccan hyll	1086 *Buchehelle*, D. B. 158. 1200– *Buckehull, Bikehell*, Testa de N. 101, 112. 1149 *Buckenhull*, Osn. Reg. 22. 1535 *Buknel*, Val. Eccl. (Map).
Chimney	*Ceomman īēg	985 ? *Ceommenige*, C. D. IV, 275. 1274–9 *Chemeneye*, Rot. Hund. II, 705.
Osney	*Osan īēg	999–1006 *Osanig*, Thorpe 550. 1191–1205 *Oseneye*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 40.
Lewknor	*Lēofecan ōfer	1178 etc. *Levekenore*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 47 etc.
Witney	*Wit(t)an īēg	1044 *Wittanige*, C. D. IV, 92. 1200– *Wyteney*, Testa de N. 104.
Sydenham (Sidnəm)	Sidan hām	1200– *Sidenham, Sideham*, Testa de N. 100, 7.

[This may, however, <æt sīdan ham(m)—'at the wide enclosure.']

In these names the *n* of the genitive case combines with the second element to form the last syllable of the word.

Sometimes in the case of *hăm(m)* there are two types—with and without *n*. If the aspirate is retained the *n* probably disappears, if it is lost the *n* remains before the vowel. The type without *n* sometimes survives. Examples are Culham (above), Clapham (O.E. *Clappan* or *Cloppan hām*), Swaffham (O.E. **Swæfan hām*—Skeat, *Place-Names Cambridgeshire*, p. 23), Pelham (O.E. *Peolan hām—Place-Names Hertfordshire*, p. 31), Waltham (O.E. **Wealtan hām—ibid.* p. 33), Bilham (O. E. *Billan hām*—Moorman, *West-Riding Place-Names*, p. 261).

(3) The third class of weak names consists of those in which the genitive suffix is retained either as *-en, -in* or *-ing*. It will be noticed that in all these names the genitive is followed by *-tūn* or *-dūn*.

Weak names which change -an to -en, -in, -ing.

(*a*) *-an* > *-en* > *-ing.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Attington	*Attan dūn	1274–9 *Attendon*, Rot. Hund. II, 821.
Bullingdon	*Bulan denn	1274–9 *Bulenden* } Rot. Hund. II, 38, *Bolendon* } 713. *Bulendon*, II, 718. *Bulingdene*, *Bullingdene*, etc. II, 30, 46.
Easington	*Æscan } dūn Esan }	1086 *Esidone*, D. B. 160. 1150† *Esendone*, Reg. Godst. Nunn. 322. 1274–9 *Esindon*, Rot. Hund. II, 756.
Goddington	*Godan dūn	1086 *Godendone*, D. B. 159 a. 1391 *Goddyngdon*, *Goddington*, Cal. A. D. I, 396.
Oddington	*Otan dūn	1086 *Otendone*, D. B. 160 b. 1200– *Otindon*, etc. Testa de N. 101. 1274–9 *Otendun*, etc. Rot. Hund. I, 45.
Tiddington	*Tyttan dūn	1086 *Titedone*, D. B. 160 b. 1200– *Tetindon*, Testa de N. 105.
Wiggin(g)ton	*Wigan } tūn Wycgan }	1086 *Wigentone*, D. B. 160. 1200– *Wigentone*, *Winginton*! Testa de N. 101, 4.

Chippinghurst (O.E. *Cybban hyrst*) would, at first sight, appear to be a case of a similar development, but the change is probably due to popular etymology, the first element being confused with Chipping < O.E. *cēapian* (to bargain, market), as in Chipping Norton.

(*b*) *-an* > *-en.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Assendon	Asan tūn	1614 *Assenton*, Index 26. 1695 *Assington*, Map in Camden's *Britannia*.
The *-en* type has survived.		
Checkendon	Cæccan denn	1086 *Cecadene*, *Secendene*, *Secedene*, D. B. 159 a, 160. 1200 *Chakenden*, *Chakeden*, etc. Testa de N. 102, 6.

It appears from the foregoing that the tendency is for the weak genitive suffix to disappear except under the conditions stated. The cause of its retention before an aspirate or a vowel is obvious—it coalesces with the second element to form a syllable and its loss would cause a hiatus.

In the other cases the suffix is retained before *-dūn* and *-tūn* usually as *-ing* (very rarely *-en*). This tendency may possibly be due to the fact that the initial consonant of these elements is a point

consonant and therefore similar to *n* (point-nasal). O.E. *-trēow* as in Coventry (< *Cofan trēow*) is another second element before which the *-n* seems to be kept.

It can hardly be entirely due to chance that we find, speaking generally, that the *-n* tends to disappear before every other element except these three; there may therefore be a phonetic cause at the basis of the differentiation.

It cannot be said, however, that any of these principles apply universally. In addition to the cases of *n* being lost before *-hām* which are mentioned above, there are cases of the weak suffix being lost before *-tūn*, e.g. Potton (O.E. *Pottan tūn*—Skeat, *Place-Names Bedfordshire*, p. 54), Watton (O.E. *Wadan tūn*—*Place-Names Hertfordshire*, p. 49), Harlton (O.E. **Herlan tūn*—*Place-Names Cambridgeshire*, p. 10), Ripton (O.E. *Rippan tūn*—*Place-Names Huntingdonshire*, p. 345), Brampton (O.E. *Brandan tūn*—*ibid.* p. 342).

In some of these cases, however, the *-n* is preceded as well as followed by a point consonant and this might be sufficient to cause its disappearance.

In *-den* we have such names as Cobden (< *Cobban denn*—*Place-Names Hertfordshire*, p. 23), and Munden (*Mundan denn*—*ibid.* p. 22). The latter, however, normally loses the *n*.

In order to illustrate one of the causes which has been suggested to explain the loss of the strong genitive suffix (see above, p. 67), I append a list of examples of interchange between the strong and weak suffixes.

(1) *Substitution of strong genitive for weak genitive.*

(*a*) *Permanently.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Harpsden	*Hearpan denn	1086 *Harpendene*, D. B. 159. 1200– *Harpesden*, Harpeden, Testa de N. 111, 117. 1274–9 *Harpesden*, Rot. Hund. I, 33.

(*b*) *Sporadically.*

Banbury	*(æt) Banan byrig	1086 *Banesberie*, D. B. 155. 1239 *Bannebiry*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 1.
Chilworth	*Ceolan wyrth	1200– etc. *Chelewrth*, Testa de N. 100. 1274–9 *Chulleworth*, *Cheleworth*, *Chelesworth*, *Chellesworth*, Rot. Hund. II, 714, 5, 6. 1316 *Chelewortlie*, Parl. Writs, II, 353.
Rofford	*Roppan ford	1086 *Ropeford*, D. B. 160 b. 1205 *Roppesford*, Obl. Rlls, I, 334. 1316 *Ropford*, Parl. Writs, II, 354 etc.
Sibford	*Sibban ford	1200– *Sibeford*, *Sibesford*, *Sibbeford*, Testa de N. 100, 4.

(2) *Substitution of strong genitive -s for feminine genitive.*

Modern Name	Conjectural O.E. Forms	Early Forms
Fritwell	*Friþa wiella ?	1154 *Fertewelle*, Eynsh. Ch. I, 39. 1199 etc. *Fretewelle*, I, 132. 1260 *Fretheswelle*, I, 400. 1231–2 *Fritwell*, St Frid's Ch. II, 40.

[The first element is perhaps however not originally a Personal Name, but the addition of *s* would show that it was later regarded as one.]

Cf. in *Lancs.*

***Gunnels Fold**	*Gunhilde ford	1250 *Gunnildes ford.*

(3) *Substitution of weak for strong genitive.*

(*a*) *Permanently.*

Bletchingdon	*Blæcces {tūn / dūn	1086 *Blecestone*, *Blicestone*, D. B. 154, 160 b. 1139+ *Blachedon*, *Blechedon*, Reg. Godst. Nunn. 214. 1200– *Blecchesdon*, Testa de N. 112. 1274–9 *Blehcchesdone*, Rot. Hund. II, 830. 1279 *Blechindon*, Abbr. Plac. 197.

(*b*) *Sporadically.*

Cutslow	*Cūþes hlāwe	995 ? *Cudeshlāwe*, *Cudanhlǣwe*, C. D. III, 289.
Sarsden	*Serces (*Sǣrices) denn	1152–70 *Sercesd(ene)* } Eynsh. Ch. I, 112. 1180 *Cercendene* } 1181–97 *Cherchesdena*, *ibid.* I, 122.
Woolaston	*Wīglāfes tūn	1200– *Willavinton*, Testa de N. 127. 1267 *Wilavestone*, Cal. Ch. Rlls, II, 69.

[Perhaps *-in* < *-ing*, see above. Cp. also *Brihthelminton*, above.]

Toot Baldon	Thēodbaldes tūn ?	1274 *Todbaldiston*, Abbr. Plac. 192. 1312 *Totbaldyndone*, Index, p. 36.

[But if this Place-Name < *tōt* (a hill) + *Baldon* which < *Bealdan dūn* the form in *Abbr. Plac.* is an instance of the converse process.]

All the preceding cases prove that confusion frequently arose in M.E. between the strong and weak genitival endings, and we see that sometimes the strong form survived sometimes the weak. This survival is not determined by any phonetic considerations but is merely a matter of chance.

So far as can be judged from the evidence here examined, the genitive suffix shows the following tendencies in its development. (1) The strong genitive in *-s* normally persists in Place-Names; sometimes, however, when the Personal Name consists of more than one syllable it is lost, and the process which the name undergoes in many cases is probably first a substitution of a weak for a strong genitive, and secondly the normal loss of the weak genitive. Such

names have usually lost their genitive *-s* by the thirteenth century—often much earlier.

(2) The weak genitive is normally lost in Place-Names except when it occurs before a second element which has an initial aspirate (which is dropped), vowel, or point consonant. In the first and second cases it remains as *n*; in the latter case it usually develops into *-ing* before the ending *-tūn* (*-ton*), and into *-en* or *-ing* before *-dūn*, *-den*(*n*) and *-trēow*.

Finally, interchange between strong and weak genitival endings is frequent in the M.E. forms of Place-Names and in some cases this interchange is permanent.

In conclusion it must be stated that these are only tendencies which manifest themselves in the development of the genitive case and that they do not possess the rigidity of phonetic laws.

HENRY ALEXANDER.

OXFORD.

AN ANGLO-FRENCH LIFE OF SAINT OSITH[1].

Language and Versification.

As few Anglo-Norman texts are accessible in good editions, it seems fitting to follow the method as far as possible of one of the best of these—Professor Stimming's *Boeve de Haumtone*—and to present this study of the language of the Life of St Osith in the same order; we can then refer to the pages in his edition where references are made to other texts and thus economise space. We shall refer to his edition as St. and to Suchier's *Voyelles toniques* as S. The comparison is made all through with Central French. The two portions of the poem which, as we have stated in the Introduction, appear to be of doubtful originality, will be referred to as (A) and (B) when they call for special notice.

Vowels.

§ 1. French *a*.

This sound appears regularly as *a* in conformity with Central French as is proved by the rimes in *a*, e.g. 33, 165, 173, 467 etc., also in (B) 221, 227, 348. Neither the scribe nor the author knew the form in *ai* (cf. *Vie de saint Richard*[2]). Other pure rimes in *-a* are: *-able* 17; *-acle* 365; *-age* 71, 375; *-as* 371, 653; *-ast* 119, 563.

Before *l*, the development of Latin *-a* tonic shows hesitation; thus side by side with the correct *tel* : *ostel* 1123 (cf. § 4) we find *esperital* 308 (cf. § 59) but only in (B); the remaining rimes in *-al* [all in (B)] are correct—305, 307.

This hesitation of the ending < *-alis* is found often in Anglo-Norman and Norman, commonly in the West of France, while it is correct in S. W. French dialects. For Agn. Gaimar has *ostel* : *criminel* 545; *mal* : *estal* 3129. Adgar rimes *mal* : *reial* xvii 545; *vassals* : *reials*

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. VI, No. 4.

[2] *Vie de saint Richard* in *Revue des Langues romanes*, Oct. 1910. We shall refer to this life again simply as *St Richard*.

xxxiv 93; *mals* : *criminals* xxviii 105 etc. In our poem both poet and scribe knew only the forms *tel* and *quel*. Before *r* here as elsewhere in Agn. we find sometimes *e*, e.g. *herneschant* 913.

In the protonic syllable *a* remains, at least in the orthography; nothing further can be said as there are no cases of rich or over rich rime. Thus we find *laur* 895; *flael* 1428 etc.; and after a palatal *chaere* 1639, 1649, and the learned *chanoine* 1263 etc., *charité* 1468.

Here as elsewhere in Agn. we have *chescun*.

The protonic syllable has disappeared in *granter* 1093, though it would seem to be required in the original text in line 723.

Protonic initial *a* is sometimes replaced by a different prefix *en* as *entendirent* for *atendirent* 803; *enchesoun* 304 for *achoison* or *achoise*, *ensemblé* 428. [St., pp. 172—3.]

§ 2. French *ã*.

The Agn. custom of writing *-an* as *-aun* is rare in our poem; we find only *auntes* 206 (B); the rimes in *-ant* are all pure, cf. 61, 185, 473, 535, 541 etc. and 317—9 in (B), also those in *-ance* 157 and in *-andre* 41; *orient* and *talent* which hesitate in Agn. and Norman are here found only in rime with *-en*, cf. § 6. Here, as commonly in Agn., we have *uncore*, a form which may be due to analogy with *unc*, *onc* < unquam. In the protonic, the scribe at any rate uses *en*, e.g. *ensenglanté* 817, 823. [St., p. 173; S. § 39.]

§ 3. French open *e* [ɛ].

After *e* and before *u* < *l* a glide *a* has developed; thus *beau passim*; this sound may then rime with *-aus* < *al* + *s*, cf. *beaus* : *chivaus* 25 (cf. S. §§ 58 a, 59 b). The rimes in *-e* are mainly pure, cf. *chancel* : *bel* 1203; *mantel* : *pasturel* 331 (B); *novele* : *ancele* 433 (cf. S. § 15 b): *apele* 635; *anceles* : *puceles* 49; *pucele* : *bele* 169; *apres* : *confes* 965 : *ades*; *pert* : *sert* 5; *apert* : *cert* 189 : *offert* 1615; *tempeste* : *moleste* 865; those in *-ere* are furnished only by *terre*, *guerre*, and *quere* or their derivatives, cf. 83, 380, 1075, 1085, 1163, 1565.

There is some hesitation with *est*, it rimes correctly with *prest* 571 but also with *icest* 543, 729; a similar rime may be found in the *Tristan* of Béroul 2049 and in the *Bestiaire* of Philippe de Thaon 881 *est* : *met* < mittit, and with this may be compared the rime *ere* (< erat) : *pere* in *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* 511[1] and *Énéas* 2159, 3927.

The words *mariners* : *juvenels* 883 have been corrected in a footnote to the text. [St., p. 174.]

[1] Our edition of this interesting life is to appear shortly.

§ 4. French close *e* [e].

Central Old French possessed two varieties of close *e* which may have differed by length only:

A. Close short *e* < Latin checked *ē* and *ĭ* except before nasal consonant. There is no satisfactory rime on this sound; *richesse* : *tristesse* 15 proves nothing as both represent *-itia*[1] but the former should give *richise*; the other *-chiiet* : *met* 601 is hardly satisfactory; here *chiiet* of the MS. or perhaps *chuet*, since the right to left strokes which are usually found over *i* are here absent, would seem to be for *calet*, the word does not appear elsewhere in the poem but it is found in Agn. as *cheut* and *chiut* (Central French *chieut*) in the *Quatre Livres des Rois* and in Samson de Nantuil who rimes *chiut* : *suit* (cf. Suchier § 32 a). If *chuet* is the correct reading of the MS., it seems likely that it is an alteration of the scribe for *cheut*; this change of spelling should indicate a pronunciation *ö* which varied between *œ* and *ɸ* according to the consonant which followed; the presence of the labial nasal in *met* may have produced an effect of rounding (the *ę̋* is very rare in rime[2]) and have caused the poet to consider the rime good enough. Another solution seems possible and this is that the poet wrote the form *chiet*; *ie* standing for *ieu*, a reduction to be found in several Norman and Agn. poets, cf. *fieu* > *fié*, e.g. *fiez* : *veziëz*, Marie de France, *Eliduc* 63; this would then give a rime *ié* : *ę̋*; similar rimes are found e.g. *clers* (< clĕricos) : *fers* (< fĕros) *St Gilles* 2241; *clerz* : *querz* in Frère Angier, *Grégoire* 3 r°a.

B. *e* long < Latin *a*.

The instances are extremely common and words with this accented vowel form a large percentage of the rime words. The rimes are pure, viz.:

é 21, 93, 95, 129, 143 etc., also in (B) 205, 327 etc.
ée 69, 127, 171.
ef *nef* : *tref* 945, also (B) 276.
el *tel* : *ostel* 1123, cf. § 1.

[1] What should be the outcome of *-itia* is a much discussed difficulty; we have *richise* (*Poème moral*); *richeise* (Adgar xxx 29); *St Gilles* has *richeise* and *richaise* and *richesce* 356, 277, 549 but only *richeise* (:*peise*) in rime; *Bestiaire* has *justise* :*mise* 67 and *richeise*: *depreise* 1409. We may suppose *richesce* to be a younger form.

[2] For the scarcity of this rime cf. S. § 16 e and Förster in *Zeitschrift* xxviii, 508; the tirades of any assonanced *chanson de geste* will if long be found on examination to consist largely of diminutives as final words; in rimed poems, *ę̋* hardly furnished ·1 per cent. of the rimes, thus *met* occurs in rime only three times in Wace, cf. Pohl in *Rom. Forsch.* ii, p. 544; twice in Benoit, cf. Stock in *Rom. Stud.* iii, 450; twice in *Énéas* 3721, 8981 (*metent* : *getent* 3833); once in Adgar 29. 46; once in *Ste Marie* 1083, and not at all in *St Gilles* or the *Adamspiel*, while in the Bestiaire we find *met* : *bec*, the vowel of which is probably open, cf. § 3.

er infinitives of the 1st conjugation are very numerous, cf. § 17 (for *targer* : *saver* 304 cf. § 15).

ere rime furnished only by *pere* : *mere* 23, 133.

ez 2nd person pl. of verbs and a few other words as *delez* : *prez* 323 and the endings *-atus*, *-atos*.

Different spellings are used to denote this sound, viz.:

(i) *e* as above and also in *el* < alum for aliud 1301, *heent* 796, *sevent* 185, *set* 96, 544.

(ii) *ee* as *neez* 32, cf. also *vv.* 369—70.

(iii) *ei* as *asenseie* (: *veie*, cf. § 15) 1181.

(iv) *i* as in the form *remis* for *remes* < remansum; this past participle is found in certain Agn. and Norman works, cf. Suchier § 17 d. [St., pp. 175—6.]

§ 5. French atonic *e*.

A. Before the accented syllable.

Side by side with the correct and usual form *e* as in *chevache* 601, *chemin* 273, *cheminal* 307, *acheminé* 270, *enchesoun* 304, *poseer* 1453, *repelle* 378 etc. we have other spellings:

(i) *a* *asaer* 937, *manascer* 703.

(ii) *i* *chival* 26, 600, 605; *cristiene* 795; *diable* 1313; *ordinez* 417, 1251; *primere* 157.

(iii) *o* (*u*) *sucur* 125; *solunc* 1599; *pour* 630; *suveus* 344; *sovaus* 1578; *pousté* 1666.

(iv) In the 3rd pl. pres. indic. *-ent* appears frequently as *-unt*, e.g. *atendunt* 28 etc.

Very early (certainly since the fourth decade of the twelfth century) Agn. words are found in which atonic *e* is either omitted or not counted in scansion. The earliest to show this reduction seem to be nouns in *-ure* as the *porture* 380, *enveisure* 992 of our text and a compound like *bonurté* and perhaps *bonuré* 127; next in order come past participles in *-ëu* as *jëu*, *vëu*, cf. 1153, and *granté*, cf. 1214, then the corresponding preterites as our *decut* 1400, *jut* (: *apercut*) 1139; about the same time is to be placed the mutation of the feminine *e* of adverbs: *drein* 871; *memes* 246, 1570 (but cf. 1576); *seurement* (cf. 88), *veraiement*.

B. After the accented syllable.

It is a sign of late thirteenth century Anglo-Norman to find the final *e* wanting; except for *un'* 869 and *el'* 1573, this occurs only in (B) *disai* 201, *merveil* 266 (: *conseil*), *chai* (: *obli*) 281, but cf. § 55 II, *chausé* 335.

It is doubtful whether the rime *verité* : *voé* 527 is a case of disappearance of final *e*; although only *voée* seems to be known in the sense of *vow*, it is possible that a masculine form may also have existed; it should be noticed that the adjective is in the masculine. In the *Haveloc* we find *avowé* as a masculine (: *adubbé*) 927.

We may now enquire into the syllabic value of this *e* and we shall consider (B) apart.

I. In the following cases *e* appears in the orthography and is syllabic.

(*a*) Nouns: *deable* 1309, 1313; *ordenez* 660; *reïne* 134, 688; *seüs* 562; in line 697 the initial word *mes* should be omitted.

(*β*) Pronoun: *ele* 1388.

(*γ*) Verbs: (i) past participles: *creu* 1332; *leue* 67; *seu* 68, 1042; *peu* 115; *veu* 444, 561, 927, 1064, 1306, 1402 and 309 (B).

(ii) other parts of the verb: *deusent* 1453; *deseelez* 1409; *poseer* 1453; *veum* 21; *veeit* 168; *veeir* 348 (B).

(*δ*) Adjectives and adverbs: *derein* 1097; *verai* 59; *nomeement* 1300, 1605.

(*ε*) The *e* is also counted after a vowel with following consonant: *contrée* 186; *guarrie* 1284; *portée* 1217; *venue* 1212; *voie* 1170.

(*ζ*) The word *sire* which in Agn. often counts for one syllable only (cf. St Richard § 77) is here dissyllabic, e.g. 1142, 1161, 1587.

II. In the following cases *e* appears but is not counted.

(*a*) Nouns: *deable* 696, 1303 (cf. I(*a*) above); *havene* 877 etc.; in *abeïes* 784 the line appears to have been altered by the scribe who has inserted *la* unnecessarily.

(*β*) Pronouns: *une* 536; *ele* 1246, 1301, 1388, 1572; *cele* 1177, 1231 etc.

(*γ*) Verbs: *purveu* 1153, especially with the combination mute + liquid: *enbeverez* 493; *troverez* 1173; *severez* 1364; *deliverat* 1408; *avera passim*; since *teoldé* 874 is not found elsewhere, it is difficult to decide, but as *tialz* (see footnote to l. 874) is dissyllabic the verb should be also, the line could be emended by omission of *bien*.

(*δ*) Adjectives and adverbs: *veraie* 1286; *vereiement* 1597; *seurement* 88; *meimes* 493, 575; *cume* 1398.

(*ε*) Preposition: *dekes* = *dek'* 1018 and elsewhere.

An *e* may be inserted contrary to etymology and will then not be counted, e.g. *creient* 5; *empouerist* 692; *perdeu* 169, 1676; *seurveillie* 1104.

In the section we call (B) the accented vowel is generally silent

in any position, thus: *age* 264 for *eage*; *ewe* 273; *sust* 253; *seumes* 338; *peust* 360; *deust* 359; *preist* 228; *veistes* 329; *veimes* 334; *venir* 261; *appela* 241; *amedouz* (fem.) 341 influenced by *ansdous*; *une* 290. [St., pp. 176—84.]

§ 6. French *ẽ*.

The nasal is invariably represented by *en* and the rimes are all pure, there is no confusion of *en* and *an* (cf. § 2). Rimes in *-ent* (41 in all) are pure as e.g. *prent* : *follement* 9; *entent* : *sovent* 101 etc.; even *talent* and *orient* rime with *vent* 906, *premerement* 1341 and with *rent* 837; the same is true for (B). The purity of the rimes is carried through even before a heavy consonant group, e.g. *prendre* : *atendre* 657; *entre* : *ventre* 611.

As in Central French we have *volentiers* 119, 250. The change of the suffix *a* to *en* as in *enchesoun* 304 (compared with the correct form *achesun* l. 1508), common in thirteenth century Agn., is attributable to the scribe. Cf. § 1. [St., pp. 184—5.]

§ 7. French *i*.

This vowel appears regularly as *i* : *belif* 947; *dis* 1653 etc.; the spelling *y*, frequent in the latter part of the thirteenth century (cf. Stürzinger, *Orthographia gallica*, rule 17), is little used in our poem; we find however *ly* 549; *say* 1162 (but *sai* 1164); *noyse* 536; *ymage* 1492; *Ynguar* 770.

The rimes in *-i* are pure, consisting chiefly of past participles of the second conjugation, e.g. ll. 57, 149, or of *ci*, *si*, *merci* etc., e.g. 187, 351, 353, 471. Rimes in *-ie* are pure also, e.g. ll. 75, 123 etc. The same is true of the following rimes: *-ir* (mainly infinitives) 75, 413, 453, 457, 497 etc.; *-ire* 445, 455 etc.; *-ist* as *fist* : *prist* 117; *-it* 463, 495, 1175; *-is* 393, 399 etc.; *-ise* 361, 693, 1245; *-iz* 233. This *i* comes regularly from *-iei* as *mi* 278 and may be in rime with *i* < Latin *i*; cf. l. 471. In the protonic *i* appears also as *deliat* 1407; *otria* 249; septimus is represented by *sime* 1240 by analogy with *dime*, *disme* and the ending *-ime*.

In Agn. the spellings *ei* and *ie* are found sporadically, e.g. *preisa* 165, 168; *vierent* 1200. [St., pp. 185—7.]

§ 8. French *ĩ*.

This sound is represented by *-in* as *fin* : *chemin* 27, 1169; *enclin* 637; the rimes in *-in* are pure as too are those in *-ine* 697; *-int* 215, 425, 485. There is only one case of *-ein* for *-in*, viz. *veint* 1613. For *creient* see § 18 [St., p. 188.]

§ 9. French open *o* [ɔ].

A. ɔ < popular Latin *au*.

This sound is almost exclusively represented in Agn. by *o* and it would appear to keep its open quality intact; there is only one rime in our poem—*chose* : *pose* 533; other words are: *or, unkore, noe* 591; *estorer* 741; *loer* 56; *osum* 653; *oster* 1115; *otreia* 222; and the various parts of the verb *oïr*. The reading *out* 433 should doubtless be *ot* as in line 95 while the outcome of *apud* figures often as *ou* 238, 628, cf. § 24. For this *ou* cf. Miss Pope's *Étude sur la langue de Frère Angier*; St., p. 189 and S. § 13 c.

B. ɔ < Latin checked and atonic *ŏ*.

This sound is also generally represented by *o*; e.g. *col* 281; *cors* 347; *fors* 348; *fort* 610; *folie* 1425; *novele* 1549; *orer* 886; *volage* 239. Since the rimes in *-ose* are so rare in Agn. we may quote the following:

Adgar *chose* : *glose* 36. 42; : *rose* 9. 143.
Simund de Freine *chose* : *pose* St G. 855.
Vie de Ste Catherine *chose* : *ose* 1299 : *pose* 2063.
Chardry *repose* : *Theodose* S.D. 831; *rose* : *disclose* S.D. 623.
Vie de Ste Marie l'Égyptienne *chose* : *rose* 467.
Vie de St Richard *chose* : *parclose* 27.
Disputeison de l'ame et du corps *chose* : *rose* iv 3, 6.

Suchier (§ 13, a 4) admits as providing open *o* in French a number of borrowed words where *ŏ* or *ō* are in open syllables. [St., p. 189.]

§ 10. French close *o* [o].

French close *o* has doubtless the sound [u], i.e. *ou* in Agn. and the MSS. use this symbol very extensively. In our poem the words riming on this sound have generally *u*, e.g. *creatur* : *seigniur* 9; *honur* : *amur* 39; *tur* : *jur* 1103, 1149 etc.; other than in rime the stressed syllable is always represented by *u*, *curuce* 684; *dutuse* 109; *joiuse* 230; *mustre* 1; *tut* is also found as *tuit*, e.g. 48. In the syllable under secondary stress both *o* and *u* are found and occasionally *ou*: *sovent* 100; *doter* 35; *mustrer* 343; *purrum* 75; *oure, houre* 865 but *hore* 569; *nus, vus, cum, but, mut, dunc* always appear with *u* and spellings with *u* form about eighty per cent. of the whole; the spellings *ou* and *ui* seem rare: *voua* 124; *tuit* 381; *ou* < *o* + vocalised *l* remains. [St., pp. 190—91.]

§ 11. French *õ*.

Although *u* is so common for *o*, *un* is less frequent than *on*. In the rime words *on* occurs with only two exceptions—ll. 675, 773; the

first plural ending is always *-um*; *conseil* and compounds of cum- are regularly *com-*; *doner* is always so spelt; *son* is much commoner than *sun*, but curiously enough while *-ons* is always so spelt, *unt* is preferred without exception, the same is true for *-unde* 587; we find both *long* and *lung*, *longement* and *lungement*; the ending *-ion* is constant. The spelling *-oun* is rare. [St., pp. 191—2.]

§ 12. French *u* and *ũ*.

The sound is represented by two spellings, *u* and *ui*, the second is rare; there seems to be only one example in our poem: *estuit* for *estut* 1648. The rimes are pure, e.g. those in (i) *u* 81, 115, 505, 523 and in (B) 195, 309, 311; (ii) *ue* 67, 443; (iii) *ume* 875; (iv) *ure* 1, 355, 701, 991; (v) *us* 107, 561, 1223; (vi) *ut* 181, 1137; with one exception *aventure*: *oure* 547. As is common in Agn. de usquam appears as *deke*, *dekes*.

The nasal *u* is rare, it occurs once only in rime and offers no varieties in orthography. [St., p. 193.]

§ 13. French *ai*.

The sound *ai* began early to develop into *e*; among the first words to show this are *ewe* 273, *lermes* 1499 or where *ai* is followed by a heavy consonant group, e.g. *mestre* 209, *nestre* 193; later the change is found in any enclosed position. The change is more complete in Agn. than elsewhere and occurs in any position; the sound varies between close and open *e*. When *ai* was final it appears to have retained its diphthongal pronunciation throughout the thirteenth century. The change is explained as taking place through *ei* and all three spellings, *ai*, *ei*, *e*, are to be found. Examples of these are: *contraite* 1067; *fait* 138; *feit* 478; *treit* 168; *fet* 4; *mes* 238; *trere* 1196. This last spelling is perhaps commoner than either of the others. The reduction of *ai* to *a* seems only to occur in unstressed syllables, e.g. *paens* 763. The spelling *ai* occurs also for *ei*, e.g. *disaie*: *tuchaie* 201 (B). The rimes in *ai* are strikingly pure: (i) *ai diray*: *lay* 1559; otherwise this rime is furnished only by the ending of the first person of the preterite or future as in ll. 199, 315, 989; (ii) *ait mesfait*: *plait* 111; *ait*: *vait* 553; cf. also ll. 669, 933, 967 against an incorrect rime *vait*: *dreit* 899; (iii) *aire* pure for *faire*: *traire* 1355 and *here*: *trere* 1495 while for *feire* (< fēria): *trere* 1195 we may assume that *ei* > *ai* before *ai* > *e* and this is supported by the modern spelling *fair*; the single rime in *-aite* is pure also, despite the spelling, *contraite*: *desheite* 1159. [St., pp. 193—6.]

§ 14. French *aĩ*.

This sound is generally represented by *ein*, e.g. *meins* 785; *pleint* 1242; *seinte* no other spelling; *seinteté* 236 etc. The rimes are with one exception pure, e.g. *mains* : *noneins* 785 (the spelling of the MS. is retained); *main* : *à plein* 781, 925, 943 (*plein* < *plano*, cf. G. Paris, *St Gilles*[1] xxvii); *drein* : *prochein* 871 but *main* : *sein* (< sinus) 667. The rimes in *aine* are, however, confused, *funtaine* : *meine* 799; *peine* : *semeine* 1295; that in *-aint* is pure, *remaint* : *plaint* 1125. The result of an enquiry I have made into these rimes in Agn. texts of the twelfth century[2] is as follows:

1. Philippe de Thaun:

(*a*) *Comput.* No examples of confusion.

(*b*) *Bestiaire.* One doubtful case, cf. Walberg, Introduction, p. xlviii.

2. *Reimpredigt.* No faulty rimes.

3. Gaimar. One faulty rime in *ain*, viz. *plain* : *serein* 767. Vising in his *Étude sur le dialecte anglo-normand du xii^e siècle*, p. 84 quotes as instances of confusion *grifaine* : *quinzaine* 3007 and *plein* : *main* 4033, but *grifaine* of the first is regularly found in rime with words in *-aine* and *aigne*, and *plein* of the second example might conceivably be for *plain*, such is the reading of one at least of the MSS.

4. Adgar, *Miracles.* Fifteen cases of confusion.

5. G. de Berneville, *St Gilles.* No confusion.

6. *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne.* Only one clear case of confusion, *quarantaine* : *ceine* 747.

7. *Le Donnei des Amants* (*Romania* xxv p. 497 seq.). *sein* is found twice in rime with *main* 787, 801 and once with *vilein* 831.

8. Chardry. Two cases of confusion.

Our poem is therefore in this particular not more advanced than several poems that are older. [St., p. 196.]

§ 15. French *ei* (later *oi*).

This sound occurs in Agn. correctly only as *ei*, e.g. *dei* 1598; *eire* 258; *feire* 1195 (cf. § 13); *feiz* 346; *neir* 331; also *ei* < *e* + *n* and *l* mouillées as in *deignast* 343; *esmerveilliée* 302. The following spellings are also found: (i) *e* in *aparer* 617; *aver* 98; *mescrere* 1319; (ii) *i* in

[1] So also in Wace: *E prent quanque il treue a plein*, *Rou* 1698.

[2] I have, of course, noted special works on the subject as Vising, *o. c.* (1882) and Rolfs, *Adgarlegenden* in Vol. I (1883) of the *Romanische Forschungen*, though it will be noticed that I do not always arrive at similar results; this is due to the fact that better editions are now available.

damisele 274; *deviez* 1403; (iii) *oi* in *moi* 244; *damoisele* 315, 329. [Note these are only found in (B).]

The sound is probably still slightly diphthongal; it is only found in rime with itself as is shown by the following lines: (i) *-ei* in *fey* : *ley* 141, 423; *rey* : *mey* 451; (ii) *-eis* in *reis* : *Engleis* 131; (iii) *-eil* in *veil* : *peil* 689; (iv) *-eille* in *merveille* : *veille* 1193; (v) *-eir* in *veir* : *poeir* 509; (vi) *-eit* in *esteit* : *aveit* 517; *espleit* : *veneit* 559 : *dreit* 784 (cf. § 54 iv).

Our poem contains four instances in which *veie* < *via* is in rime with feminine past participles <*-ata*, viz. *alée* 811, *asenseie* 1185, *portée* 1207, *entrée* 1333. This is not a proof that *ei* has become *e* but that *é* followed by a feminine *e* has a tendency to diphthongise. There are instances of this in Frère Angier, e.g. *veies* : *remuées* (see Miss Pope's *Étude sur la langue de Frère Angier*, p. 11), and also in Chardry, *monée* < *moneta* : *dunée* and *aportée* [*Sept Dormanz* 1205, 1291]. For Chardry the rime doubtless indicates that *ei* has become *é* but our text presents another instance, viz. the rime *levée* : *desree* 537; here *desree* stands for *desreie* and is therefore another instance of *-eie* : *ée*. A similar rime is to be found in *Aiol*, a late twelfth century text with N.E. dialectic characteristics, *desree* : *trainée*, while like rimes are common in W. and S.W. dialects. It is one of the points of interest of Anglo-French to find it in agreement with continental dialects. Professor Stimming quotes (p. 175) a number of instances in which *ée* < *-áta* appears as *eie*, e.g. *espeie*, *valeie*. We have seen § 4 B above that *ei* is a recognised spelling for *e*, it is frequent in the Corpus Christi (Oxford) MS. of *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* where this sound occurs in the last word of a line. There is a tendency also in Agn. to insert *i* between the antitonic and the tonic vowel, e.g. *ayé* (< ætatem), *veyer* (< vetare) in *Boeve de Haumtone*; *loiée* (< laudata) in *Destruction de Rome* 32, an Agn. MS. of possibly some other dialect (cf. *Romania* II p. 5).

The forms *aver*, *poer*, *saver* etc. found frequently in rime in Agn. with infinitives of the first conjugation are probably cases of analogical formation (cf. P. Meyer in Bozon, *Contes*, p. lxii). Instances of this would seem to occur about the end of the twelfth century; the earliest examples I have met are in *Le Donnei des Amants* (dated by G. Paris at the end of the twelfth century); *aver* : *aler* 980, : *doloser* 1144; the cases quoted by Rolfs (*l.c.* p. 209) from Adgar are only in poems—*Gregory* and *The Abbess delivered by the Virgin*—of doubtful authenticity; in the remaining poems Adgar's rimes are pure. Our poem has one instance but only in (B), the doubly incorrect *targer* (for *targier*) : *saver*

303 and with this may be compared *esmaer* : *veer* (< videre) in the *Legend of Gregory* 1750 just mentioned.

[St., pp. 197—200 and 237—8.]

§ 16. French *eĩ*.

The sound is represented by *-ein* as *sein* 668; *ameine* 401; *peine* 402; for the rimes cf. § 14.

§ 17. French *ie*.

The sound is represented by *ie* and by *e*: (i) *ariere* 542; *chiet* 1361; *ciel* 8, 503; *fiert* 1664; *siecle* 36 (this word is generally so spelt in Agn.); (ii) *aider* 121; *cel* 377 (this spelling is rare compared with *ciel* which is found in texts which have elsewhere regularly reduced *ie* to *e*); *meuz* 89; *mester* 232 etc.; *neces* 154 etc.

The reduction of *iée* to *ie* represented by the orthography of ll. 1221—2 is not supported by a rime with *ie* < *i* + *a* etc. The rimes in *ié* are singularly pure. In the passages that may be ascribed to the original author no cases of mixed rimes, *ié* : *é*, are to be found; *posé* : *cungé* 1497; *loer* : *cher* 1497 are in the Episode we call (A). In the main body of the poem there are 145 rimes in *é* (*é, ée, ées, ef, el, er, ere, ez*) and 49 in *ié* (*ié, iée, iées, ier, iez*). In the passage we call (B) there are 18 pure rimes in *é*, 3 in *ié* and 8 mixed, viz. ll. 207, 209, 229, 231, 301, 303, 329, 367. Suchier has compiled a list (§ 29) of words which are found, now in rime with *ié* and now with *é*; of these our text contains—*regné* : *ensemblé* 428 : *volunté* 745; *malvesté* : *enticé* 1323; *deviez* (< de + vita + are) : *aler* 1403; *crier* : *deslier* 1585; *oublié* : *esté* 629. These may be left out of our calculations. The question of mixed rimes in Agn. is a very interesting one. In the earliest poets such infractions are rare but they steadily increase till a pure rime becomes a mere matter of chance. I have drawn up some statistics of the proportion of these mixed rimes in Agn. writers: thus we find

Author or work	No. of lines	Pure	Mixed	Proportion of pure to mixed
Gaimar	6534	586	9	65·1 to 1
Adgar[1]	6870	642	10	64·2 to 1
St Gilles	3794	489	12	40·9 to 1
Haveloc	1106	129	6	21·5 to 1
Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne	1534	171	13	13·3 to 1
Sainte Osith (A)	278	36	2	18 to 1
Sainte Osith (B)	about 204	21	8	2·62 to 1

[1] Adgar has the peculiarity of finishing so many of his legends with the words...*Dame chiere* : *preiere* that it is necessary to make some allowance; we have deducted therefore 40 from the number of pure rimes and from the number of total lines; the two poems named in § 15 have not been considered for this list; they contain many cases of mixed rimes.

I am not inclined to lay much stress on the proportion of pure to mixed rimes as a factor for determining the date of Anglo-French poems, but it is interesting to see how the proportion of mixed rimes corresponds roughly to the date of production. The matter of the dialect is too complicated for any one phenomenon to be decisive; it is necessary, as G. Paris stated (*St Gilles*, Introd. p. xxv) as long ago as 1881, to know something of the writer's upbringing. There is also the larger question: how many poets whose works show anglicisms are really English born or only immigrants? It seems fairly certain that Frère Angier came from a S.W. French province and that his language had become contaminated by residence in England[1]; the same, I believe, is true for the author of the *Destruction de Rome* (published in *Romania* I, pp. 1 seq.) who would seem to be a native of one of the North or North-Eastern provinces and by a lengthy stay in England could be content to allow such words as *celer* (l. 269) to find a place in a tirade of *ié* assonances or *chargié* (942), *asiegier* (1461), *Oliviers* (1501) etc. into others that contain only *é* assonances. [St., pp. 201—2.]

§ 18. French *ïẽ*.

The sound is represented by *ien* as in *bien* 5, 1270; *criendre* 106; it is reduced to *-en* only after *i* as *terrïen* 60; *crestïens* 768, 795. The spelling *creient* (ll. 3, 5) may also be noted here (cf. § 5, ii *ϵ*). The rimes in *-ien* are all pure; *bien* : *rien* 167, 389; *mien* : *rien* 437. Other Agn. authors are less careful; thus we have in Gaimar *ancienz* : *anz* 1785; in Adgar *crestiens* : *sens* 5. 101 : *tens* 6. 223 etc. Mention apart must be made of the word *nient*; it is monosyllabic in lines 47, 707, 1363 and dissyllabic in 576, 663, 845. It is generally found in rime with words in *-ent* as *entent* 663 and with adverbs in *-ment*, e.g. ll. 576, 846, 1392. This phenomenon is noticed in the earliest Agn. texts: thus in the *Bestiaire* (*nient* is not in rime in the *Comput*) we find that it is both mono- and dissyllabic and that it rimes in the same way as here (cf. Walberg's edition p. li). Gaimar has *nient* : *descent* 4019; Adgar *nient* : *gent* 31. 33 : *maintient* 30. 175 etc.; *St Gilles neent* (and *nent* 489) : *pulent* 222 : *verraiement* 1100. [St., p. 203.]

§ 19. French *ieu*.

This sound occurs in a very limited number of words and the spellings *eu* and *iu* are the most frequent; our text offers: Nominative

[1] See the work quoted in § 15. This would seem to be true for Marie de France, whose later works show anglicisms such as the earlier ones do not contain; see G. Paris' review of *L'Espurgatoire* in *Romania* XXIV p. 290 seq.

case, *Deus* 117, *Dieu* 434, *Deu* 1423; Acc., *Deu* 31, and *Dampnedeu* very frequent for both cases. The form used for purposes of the rime is commonly in Agn.[1] and many French dialects *Dé*, e.g. : *overé* 1206. We find also in our poem *geu* 992; *giu* 478; *liu* 192, 924.

[St., p. 204.]

§ 20. French *òi* [ɔi].

Very few words with this diphthong exist; it is represented here by *oi* and *oy*, e.g. *oi* (< habui) 318; *soi* (< sapui) 320; *poy* (< paucum); this last is the common form in Agn. In the dialect of our text we find that *ŏ* + *l* mouillée gives *oil* and we have *doil* 1116; *oilz* 502; and *voil* : *soil* 1475. The word *soil* does not appear in Godefroy in the Latin sense of seat which it appears to have in line 1476 but only in the sense of *souiller*. We have also the rime *estoire* : *memoire* 97; this is a stock rime in Old French, in fact only the learned words can be used for the purpose. Instances of this are—*Bestiaire, gloire* : *victoire* 205. Gaimar uses as rime words: *estoire, gloire, memoire, tempoire, victoire*, see ll. 3239, 3311, 5711. Adgar uses *estoire* and *memoire*. Most Agn. scribes write *-orie* but this is not the case in our MS.

[St., p. 204.]

§ 21. French *ói* [oi].

The diphthong is somewhat rare, it occurs in Agn. as both *oi* and *ui*, e.g. *voiz* 383; *anguisse* 517; *ui* appears to be preferred in the protonic as *anguisuse* 389 and *fuison* 1464. [St., p. 205.]

§ 22. French *oĩ*. This too is rare, it appears as *oin* and *uin*, e.g. *doint* 349 etc., *luintain* 187, *puignant* 549. It does not appear in rime.

[St., p. 205.]

§ 23. French *òu* [ɔu].

This sound only occurs in our text in verb forms: *out* < habuit 1441; *plout* < placuit 1442. This favourite rime in Agn. only occurs here twice and with the foregoing words. For the ending *-out* in imperfects of the first conjugation, see § 54 iv. [St., p. 205.]

[1] The treatment of *eu* and *ieu* in rimes needs special investigation: for *Deu* it is interesting to note that certain texts only rime with a limited group of words e.g. Gaimar *Deu* : *feu* (germ. fehu) 4321, : leu 1410; Adgar, *Deu* : *Jueu* 5. 13 : *Andreu* 19. 51 and this is also true for *Brandan*; whereas Philippe de Thaon, Fantosme, Sanson de Nantuil, *St Gilles, Ste Marie* and also Wace rime *Deu* with any word in *é* < *a*. But for the rarely occurring Nominative *Des* or *Deus* the rimes available seem to be few (cf. § 32). Thus in the *Bestiaire Des* : *esperitels* 195; Gaimar : *remes* 3601. The rime of *e(u)s* so frequently with *remes* may be more than a mere coincidence and may indicate a labialised pronunciation of *e* (cf. § 4) for we have the rimes *remes* : *tex* in Benoit, *Troie* 19495 : *Idomenes* ibid. 28921, : *ostels*, Wace, *Rou* III, 4869, 4888 and frequently in Chrestien de Troyes, : *Kes, Yvain* 2179; : *ostels, Erec* 5697; : *Gres, Cligés* 3623, 4212.

§ 24. French *óu* [ou].

Few words only contain this sound. Here we have *dous* and in (B) *deuz* 346 and *amedeuz* 341. The outcome of *ubi* is *u* 188 and *ou* 367; *ou* is often found for apud (cf. § 9) and in its place our MS. has *eu* (ll. 390, 392). [St., p. 206.]

§ 25. French *ue*.

This sound is represented in a variety of ways:

(i) *ue*: *estuet* 392; *iluec* 617, 1108; *puet* 190; *suer* 1095, 1217, 1220, 1229; *quer* 305.

(ii) *u*: *estut* 35; *iluc* 1008; *vus* (for *vues* or *veus* < vŏles) 1141.

(iii) *oe*: *poeple* 488; *iloec* 298.

(iv) *o*: *ilokes* 875; *volent* 664; *bor* (also *bour* 31) 1424.

(v) *eu*: *leus* 323; *peut* 121; *seur* 242.

(vi) As the outcome of aviolus our text has *aels* instead of *aieus*. We have considered *voil* and *soil* in § 20; the form *seur* is found in (B) in rime with *amur* 221 and with *ducur* 241, cf. § 43 iv. [St., pp. 206—7.]

§ 26. French *uẽ*.

The spelling *uen* seems almost unknown in Agn. Peter of Peckham (*St Richard*) has *suens* side by side with *seens*, which form occurs in our text 1542; the pronoun from homo is *l'em* 94, otherwise homo and bonum only give *hom* and *bon*. [St., p. 209.]

§ 27. French *ui*.

This sound is found in our poem represented by *ui* and *u*. Most of the rimes are pure, e.g. *bruit* : *tuit* 999; *ennui* : *sui* 643; *fuire* : *destruire* 767. In Norman and Anglo-Norman *ui* is often reduced to *u* when *s* follows and in Agn. in conjunction with other letters. This *u* may then rime with original *u*, e.g. *jut* : *duit* 297, 1121; *us* < *uis* : *us* < usum 1121. There are no cases in our poem of rimes of *ui* with *i* such as are to be found elsewhere, e.g. Gaimar *qui* (< cogito) : *midi* 1645; *transit* : *quit* 5137; Adgar *qui* : *ami* 28. 143. Nor are there instances of *ui* : *oi* as *destruiz* : *croiz*, Adgar 30. 31. [St., p. 209.]

Consonants.

§ 28. Liquids.

There is no rime in our poem to prove that *l* is vocalised; no *pout* : *volt* as e.g. *St Gilles* 3619; on the other hand there is nothing to prove the contrary. The same is true curiously enough for Adgar, *Haveloc*,

and *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne*, while the proof of vocalisation for Gaimar rests on the evidence of a single rime *enchascout* : *volt* 2003.

It is possible that the rime of ll. 601—2 discussed in § 4 is a case of the vocalisation of *l*. This absence of any decisive rime must be a matter of pure chance. Here as in many Agn. works *l* often remains in the orthography as in *al* 281, 518 and *del* 691; these forms are normal; our poem has also *aels* 205 (cf. § 25); *malgré* 96; *malvesté* 1324; *l* is inserted in *alme* 691, and by the scribe reduced to *u* in *espaumes* 891; *paume* 892; *voudrai* 642. It has disappeared after *u* in *ducur* 178. Sporadically in Agn. we find *a*+*u*<*l* reduced to *a*; instances in our text are *chevache* 601; *acune* 858; *sav(er)ast* 119[1]. This is not a mere scribe's error as is proved by the English *save*. Other examples I have met are *savaciun* in *St Richard* 6 and *maveis* in *Modwenna* 17 d.

The *l* mouillée is represented by *-il* when final, e.g. *conseil* : *merveil* 265 and intervocalic by *-illi-* as *ailliurs* 6; *fillie* 130 etc., or by *-ili-* as *perilié* 972. There is no rime in our poem of *l* with *l* mouillée as is often the case in Agn., e.g. *soleil* : *feeil* in *Bestiaire* 2233; *gopil* : *il* in Gaimar 281 etc.; *fedeil* : *conseil* in Adgar 28. 57; *Marsile* (=*Marseille*) : *vile* in *St Gilles* 1035.

The metathesis of *r* seems only to occur in *pernum* 100, *pernent* 773, *pernunt* 1035. Anglo-Norman texts show great confusion with this consonant and spell the same word, now with *r* and now with *rr*, as e.g. *orez* 108, *orrez* 113. A number of cases of double letters are treated together in § 41.

The pronunciation of *r* in Agn. is very weak, so that *r* in combination with another consonant may be found in rimes with that consonant. Instances of this are found from the earliest times, thus: *Bestiaire, sage* : *large* 7; *cors* : *enclos* 291; Gaimar, *ancestre* : *geste* 827; for Adgar *certes* : *estes* is in the Gregory legend 1468.

In Agn. texts *r* and *l* are often found in rime as *Bestiaire, nature* : *nule* 103; Gaimar, *apostoile* : *Theodorie* 1387; Adgar, *cler* : *alter* 30. 95, while elsewhere he only uses the form *altel* (: *el* 2. 93); *St Gilles, apostoile* : *estoire* 561. No clear case of this exists in our poem as the rime *mariners* : *juvencels* 883 is best emended as in the footnote to the text. [St., pp. 210—5.]

§ 29. Labials.

There is little to note about this group of consonants; *p* is inserted

[1] For this reading cf. § 53, 1, B.

in *Dampnedeu* (cf. § 19); *b* after *m* has disappeared in our text, e.g. *colum* 1040; *f* remains in the orthography before flexional *s*, as *cerfs* 558, *nefs* 868; *f* final remains in *tref* 275 and in the rimes *nef* : *tref* 945; *belif* : *restif* 949. For rimes of *-um, -umb-* see Walberg's edition of the *Bestiaire*, p. lvi. [St., pp. 219—20.]

§ 30. Nasals.

Final *n* and *m* are not separated in the rime; *non* < nomen : *gueredon* 7; : *compaignon* 419. This is, however, not very conclusive as a distinction is made in the *Comput*, where *un* and *um* are confused but not *n* and *m* preceded by other vowels. The distinction is perhaps only a chance one since in the *Bestiaire crestïen* rimes with *l'em*, while Gaimar has *faim* : *demain* 325. Adgar would seem to treat these consonants as does Philippe in the *Comput* but Suchier—*Reimpredigt*, p. lii—attributes this to pure chance.

In the group *rn* as *ivern* 267, *n* disappears in the rime, e.g. *jur* : *blanchur* 597; *tur* : *dolur* 63. This change is noted from the earliest times; though in the *Comput* the rimes are not quite conclusive, in the *Bestiaire* we find *jur* : *honur* 249, in Gaimar *jur* : *seignur* 319 and in Adgar *jor* : *salveor* 3. 7. Satisfactory proof may often be lacking as is the case for *Sainte Marie* and the *Reimpredigt*. The change is early on the continent, Chrétien de Troyes has *retor* : *amor* in *Yvain* 6511. Before labials *n* > *m* as *emfler* 860; *empensé* 632; it seems to have disappeared from *wydas* = *windas* in *St Gilles* 803 etc. (cf. Chaucer, *windas*, see Skeat's Glossarial Index). *N* mouillée is written *-gni-* when medial as *seigniur* 651 or *n* as *remaine* 725; *ng* when final as *lung* 275 (for various spellings of *n* mouillée see Hildebrand in *ZfrPh.* viii 321). In compounds of *cum*, *n* frequently disappears before *v* as *cuvint* 426, *couveite* 445. [St., pp. 215—9.]

§ 31. Dentals *t*, *d*.

Dentals isolated between two vowels have disappeared as is shown by the following rimes: *mie* : *vie* 11, *vie* : *amie* 75, *amie* : *hunye* 441 etc. With final dentals matters are not quite so simple in Anglo-Norman. The isolated dental become final in French has been lost in our poem in

(*a*) substantival and verbal roots:

fei < fidem : lei < legem 423; *cri* : *ci* 1119; *crei* : *rei* 255. These often rime with themselves as *vei* < vido for video : *dei* < ditum = digitum (cf. Adgar 17. 949).

(*b*) terminations, *é* < *atum*; *i* < *itum* or palatal + *edem*; *u* < *utem*, *utum*:

Dé : *overé* 1367; *gey* : *di* (< dico), *merci* : *issi* 649; *veu* : *fu* 927. (Abstract substantives and the past participles often rime among themselves as in the ll. 21, 93, 95, 129, 143, 153 etc.)

(*c*) preterites in *i* < *ivit*:

entendi : *autresi* 1357; *fini* : *issi* 351; *nasqui* : *si* 187. (Preterites of this kind are also found in rime with past participles: as *servi* : *trai* 695 and also preterites, *servi* : *guerpi* 57.)

(*d*) preterites in *-a*, *-at* rime only with themselves or with a future:

alat : *enmenat* 411; *deliat* : *deliverat* 1407; *mustra* : *verra* 1423. This proves nothing however as other rimes in *a* are rare, practically only *la* and *ja*.

(*e*) strong preterites and other words with fixed *t* rime with themselves:

mist : *cunquist* 1439; *fist* : *dist* 1263; *vait* : *ait* 554; *aït* : *dit* 1589; *petit* : *lit* 495; *plait* : *mesfait* 111. In line 904 we find the form *plai* (cf. *plait* above), this is rare (see Godefroy) but certain Norman texts have it in rime with words without fixed *t*, as *plai* : *delai* in *Chronique des ducs de Normandie* 16252 (for other instances, see Walberg, *l.c.* p. lx).

(*f*) There is an isolated case of *-st* riming with inchoative present:

ist < exit : *empourist* 691 (cf. Adgar, *nurist* : *dist* 17. 669 and § 59). *Esperit* appears normally in rime with fixed *t*, e.g. *respit* 463; in Adgar the word is in rime with *eslit* 6. 154 and with *delit* 6. 309.

This would prove that final *t* is lost. If the *t* is silent in the cases above mentioned, *a fortiori* will it be in *-et* < *-at*; although we may admit cases of hiatus yet the cases of elision are regular and prove that the *t* was entirely lost by the time our poet wrote.

When we compare this phenomenon with other Agn. texts we find:

Philippe de Thaun, *Comput:* one case of *t* riming with fixed *t* but in a line that is not well supported by MS. evidence; it may be a case of analogy.

Bestiaire: no cases.

Gaimar: some cases of preterites in *-i*, e.g. *partit* : *dit* 2514. These are best explained as analogical forms, but it should be noted that certain verbs in *-ir* show a tendency to join the weak class.

Adgar: no cases.

Sainte Marie: instances only with weak forms as (*f*) above.

The rime *païsant* : *manant* 185 may be compared with *tyrant*,

parchment, ancient. Wace, Ambroise and Gervaise and other continental writers admit these forms which are due to analogy with the ending of the present participle and words like *enfant.* [St., pp. 221—4.]

§§ 32, 33. *s, z.*

The distinction between *s* and *z* (Latin *t* + *s*) at the end of words is absolute[1]. Rimes in *-is*, e.g. *quis* : *ris* 477 ; *mis* : *amis* 671 ; *assez* : *entendez* 113 etc. are all pure. There are only two apparent exceptions *respiz* : *envis* 459, *delez* : *pres* 323, but these are clearly mis-spellings; *envis* is for *enviz* (< invitus) : *marriz* in Benoit and with *pluriz* in *St Gilles* 3240 and *pres* is for *prez* (< pratos). There are one or two instances of confusion in the *Bestiaire* but Adgar[2], *St Gilles, Ste Marie, Le Donnei des Amanz* and *St Richard* are all alike in making the distinction.

The *s* before consonant is silent for our poet; this is proved by the following rime in *-est*, i.e. *fest* (= *fait*) : *plest* 197 ; other rimes are not quite satisfactory; *dist* (for the past participle) : *fist* 217 is not conclusive as it occurs in (B) and *dist* : *respit* 499 is probably a mistake for *dit.* Other rimes are the strong perfects in ll. 111, 1337, cf. § 31, while the rimes in *-est*, viz. *est* : *cest* 543 ; *est* : *prest* 571, prove nothing.

For the scribe the mutation of *s* is proved (i) by the omission of *s* as in *acemée* 171 and when final in *for* 774, 1003 (cf. *St Gilles* 914); (ii) by its insertion when not authorised by the orthography, e.g. *aturnast* 1099, *mestez* 436, *neste* 353 etc.; (iii) by the characteristic Agn. change of *s* + *l* to *dl* in *madles* 47, *entremedlé* preserved in English *meddle* < *medler* < *mesler.*

As to the spellings we find *s* or *ss* where we now write *c* in *purchasé* 477, *issi* 483 and also *sc* for modern *ss* in *richesce* 167.

The outcome of *-itium* is *-ise* in our poem, e.g. *servise* : *guise* 1245, : *eglise* 1301. The former pair is also in the *Bestiaire* 2269. On the continent we have *servise* : *aprise* in the *Cligés* 1779 and with *esprise* in the *Énéas* 1269. [St., pp. 224—30.]

§ 34. *c* = k.

This sound is represented in our text by:

(*a*) *k* in *kar* 110 etc., *illokes* 875.

(*b*) *qu* in *quor.*

(*c*) *c* in *iluec* 617, *iluc* 1008. [St., p. 231.]

[1] The rime *sĕus* (cf. § 43 iv (*b*)) : *vĕus* 561 is a poetic licence; the word *sĕus* is rare; I have only found it once in rime in Agn., viz. Simund de Freine : *seüs* : *fus* (*St Georges* 1044).

[2] In the Gregory legend we find : *enfes* : *enpensez* 1576, while Gaimar has *purpens* : *denz* 181—2; *feiz* : *reis* 923 and some dozen further cases of confusion.

§ 35. *qu*.

The spellings *k* and *qu* are found indifferently: thus we have *ky* 101, *kant* 108, *unkes* 191 (but not *unques*) and *qui* 1178, *que* 406, *quant* 99, *quanque* 164. [St., p. 234.]

§ 36. *c* [ts].

This sound coming from *c* followed by *e* or *i* or from *cj* or *tj* preceded by consonants other than *s* is retained here, as in *ciel* 8, *comence* etc. The neuter pronoun is *ce, ceo* (cf. § 50). The spelling *-sc-* is met here as elsewhere (e.g. Gaimar, Adgar, Simund de Freine etc.) as in *manascer* 703. [St., p. 233.]

§ 37. *ch* [tʃ].

This sound comes regularly from *c* + *a* or *pj*; the first of these sources is represented by *chant* 306; *chef* 64; *chemin* 1261 and—with the spelling *sc*—by *seneschal* 1469, *meschines* 800; and the second by *sachez* (cf. § 54). Certain words occur in Northern French forms: *desaka* 289; *saké* 932; *secke* 353. As is common in Agn. the present subjunctive of *saveir* is *sace* (cf. § 55 III). [St., pp. 235—6.]

§ 38. *g* [g].

The *gu* coming from Germanic *w* is written *g* or *gu* before *a* and *gu* before *e* or *i*: *gages* (=*vague*=*wave*) 861, also *Énéas* 246; *garder* 1688; *garrir* 1090; *garisun* 1234; *guerpist* 7. Original *cr* > *gr* here as elsewhere, *graventa* 292; *granter* 1214. [St., p. 236.]

§ 39. g [dʒ].

We find both *g* and *j*; the former generally before *e* and *i* as *gesir* 299, *geta* 1241 but only *jeke* 191, and medially, *targié* 576; *j* is preferred before *o* and *u* as *joïr* 199, *jur* 301 but *gal* (for *jal*) 306. [St., p. 237.]

§ 40. *h*.

Aspirated *h* is retained in *haschie* 1222, *hernaschant* 913, *hors* 561, *huchent* 540, *hurte* 600, and *h* appears in certain words when it should be absent: *herbe* 192, *houre* 861, *hui* 334; we have *abit* 654 and *oure* otuien. [St., p. 239.]

§ 41. Double letters.

Anglo-Norman scribes are especially fond of double letters, our text presents the following:

ll apellé 128, 636.

rr dirrai 376, 986 etc.; *querrez* 67; *guarriz* 1175; *irra* 250; *verrai* 1286.

dd redde 587.
cc succurs 294.
ss essample 100. [St., p. 239.]

§ 42. The article.

The nom. sing. form *li* is very common and is retained even when the noun has lost its distinctive nominative form, e.g. *li tierz jur* 330; *li pautener* 1356; it is also found with elided *i* before nouns beginning with a vowel as *l'em* 94. In the pl. masc. *li* is also very common but the *i* of this form for no clear reason is not elided before a vowel[1]. For the article in combination with *a* and *de* cf. § 28.

A few remarks may be made on the syntax of the article:

1. Nouns are frequently found without the article, when the noun has a general sense as *a rei* 426; *apres saluz* 326, cf. too ll. 836, 876, 1303, 1309, 1330, 1432; and after certain verbs, e.g. *hurte chival* 600[2].

2. With parts of the body, side by side with the use of the possessive adjective, e.g. 667, 670, 817, 818, 825, 925 etc., we find *as piez lur chiet* 1361; *les piez li ad desseelez* 1409.

3. As a demonstrative[3]:

Seinte Osith fu le jor *alée* 797 = that day.
A l'aube del jur la matinée 269 = that morning.

The use of *le jur* seems fairly common in Old French as: *Cel jor i fu Looïs alevez, E la corone mise desus l'altel; Li reis ses pere li ot* le jor *doné. Cour. de Louis* 45—7. His father had given it (sc. the crown) to him that day. Further in Agn. Gaimar: *Franceis, Engleis* le jor *perirent* 5418; *St Gilles* has several instances: *Male guarde firent* le jur, *Quant il perdirent lur seignur* 3661–2 and also ll. 719, 2640, 2797; *Haveloc: Malement lur avint* le jor 110. The persistence of the demonstrative force in modern French as shown by the phrases *de la façon* (e.g. Est-ce de la façon que vous voulez l'entendre, Molière, *École des Femmes*, iv 4), *de la sorte, pour le coup, à l'instant*, etc. has been pointed out by Tobler, *Ver. Bei.* ii p. 44.

A. T. Baker.

Sheffield.

[1] Cf. Rydberg, *Zur Geschichte des französischen* e, p. 420 seq.
[2] Cf. Fredenhagen, *Über den Gebrauch des Artikels*, Halle 1906, p. 48.
[3] Brunot, *Grammaire historique* i, p. 232, remarks that the primitive nature of the article continued to be felt in the sense that it could take the place of the demonstrative and quotes: *Ço dist li reis*: '*Al Jesu e al mien!*'=for that (sc. the honour) of Jesus and my own (*Roland* 339; cf. too 3145 *ibid.*).

(*To be concluded.*)

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Pope's 'Rape of the Lock.'

Some of the passages in earlier writers to which Pope was apparently indebted in *The Rape of the Lock* appear to have escaped the notice of his commentators.

Lydia. Indeed, dear sir, my face would frighten back the sun.
Dapperwit. With glories more radiant than his own.
Wycherley, *Love in a Wood*, Act II, sc. i.

Compare

Sol through white curtains shot a tim'rous ray,
And ope'd those eyes that must eclipse the day..
Canto I, 13, 14.

and

Not with more glories, in th' etherial plain,
The sun first rises o'er the purpled main,
Than, issuing forth, the rival of his beams....
Canto II, 1—3.

The name Dapperwit is introduced in Canto V, 62[1].

In Dryden's *Tyrannic Love, or The Royal Martyr* the following lines occur in a speech of the Spirit Damilcar:

We wander in the fields of air below,
Changelings and fools of heaven: and thence shut out,
Wildly we roam in discontent about:
Gross heavy-fed, next man in ignorance and sin,
And spotted all without, and dusky all within.
Act IV, sc. i, 177—181.

Compare

The graver prude sinks downward to a gnome,
In search of mischief still on earth to roam.
The light coquettes in sylphs aloft repair,
And sport and flutter in the fields of air.
Canto I, 63—66.

[1] Since writing the above I have noted that Pope was probably indebted to Thomas Stanley's lines in the 1657 edition of John Gamble's 'Ayres and Dialogues (To be sung to the Theorbo-Lute or Bass-Violl)':

On this swelling bank, once proud
Of its burden, Doris lay:
Here she smil'd, and did uncloud
Those bright suns eclipse the day.

(P. 9 in Miss L. I. Guiney's edition of Thomas Stanley's Original Lyrics, J. R. Tutin, Hull, 1907.)

Gilbert Wakefield, while failing to note the passage in *Tyrannic Love*, quoted 'The realms of ocean and the fields of air' from Dryden's *Aeneid*, i, 196.

Dryden's 'dusky' may have been in Pope's mind when he wrote

> Umbriel, a dusky, melancholy sprite. Canto IV, 13.

In Dryden's *Conquest of Granada* the line

> You bane and soft destruction of mankind,
> Part I, Act III, sc. i, 317.

may be compared with

> This nymph, to the destruction of mankind,
> Nourish'd two locks. Canto II, 19.

Pope's interest in the Latin poems of the Italians and his obligations to Vida, for example, are well known. It is not improbable that in more than one place in *The Rape of the Lock* he was indebted to Aonio Paleario's *De Animorum Immortalitate*. The first book of this poem begins thus:

> Felices animae, caeli omnipotentis alumni,
> Astrorum decus, et qui versicoloribus alis
> Aethera tranatis liquidum, qui sidera, quique
> Volvitis ingentes magnis anfractibus orbes.

With 'versicoloribus alis' may be compared

> Colours that change whene'er they wave their wings,
> Canto II, 68.

while the last two lines of the Latin seem to have suggested

> Some in the fields of purest ether play,
> And bask and whiten in the blaze of day.
> Some guide the course of wand'ring orbs on high,
> Or roll the planets through the boundless sky.
> Canto II, 77—80.

The *De Animorum Immortalitate*, though not included in Atterbury's ΑΝΘΟΛΟΓΙΑ *Seu Selecta quaedam Poemata Italorum qui Latine scripserunt*, Cambridge, 1684, was among the poems added in the revised edition of that collection which appeared in 1740, London, 2 vols., with Pope's name as editor.

To return to Dryden's *Tyrannic Love*, there is a likeness between the speeches of Amariel, the Guardian-Angel of St Catharine, in which he reminds the spirits of their various duties and threatens them with punishment for their neglect, and the address of Pope's Ariel to the sylphs and sylphids.

Compare

> Hence, to the task assigned you here below!
> Upon the ocean make loud tempests blow;
> . . . . . .
> From pointed sunbeams take the mists they drew,
> And scatter them again in pearly dew.
>
> Act IV, sc. i, 163—168.

with

> Ye know the spheres, and various tasks assign'd
> By laws eternal to th' aërial kind.
> . . . . . .
> Or suck the mists in grosser air below,
> Or dip their pinions in the painted bow,
> Or brew fierce tempests on the wintry main,
> Or o'er the glebe distil the kindly rain.
>
> Canto II, 75—86.

It may be a mere coincidence, but, in view of the parallels already cited it is curious that while Dryden in *Tyrannic Love* applies the terms 'magic fumes' and 'powerful steams' (Act IV, sc. i, 192, 193) to the fumigation by which the spirits are drawn down, Pope uses 'fuming liquor' (Canto III, 114) and 'fragrant steams' (III, 134) of the coffee in the *Rape of the Lock*.

Cowley was an early favourite of Pope's, and a connexion may be traced between

> Love walks the pleasant mazes of her hair,
>
> *The Mistress*, 'The change,' I, 2.

and

> Love in these labyrinths his slaves detains, Canto II, 23.

and

> Some thrid the mazy ringlets of her hair, Canto II, 139.

In Canto V, 108,

> And chiefs contend till all the prize is lost,

Pope seems to have taken a hint from Statius, *Thebais* I, 1, 'alternaque regna profanis | Decertata odiis.' Pope in his translation, published at the same time as the *Rape of the Lock*,

> Th' alternate reign destroy'd by impious arms,

evidently followed Caspar Barth's interpretation of 'decertata,' 'perdita atque amissa concertando.'

EDWARD BENSLY.

ABERYSTWYTH.

Pope's 'Windsor Forest,' 65, 66.

The fields are ravish'd from th' industrious swains,
From men their cities, and from Gods their fanes.

Pope's own note on the couplet is 'Translated from

Templa adimit divis, fora civibus, arva colonis,

an old monkish writer, I forget who.' This statement has been reprinted again and again, but editors generally appear to have accepted Pope's obliviousness with resignation. Joseph Warton, it is true, wrote 'In Camden's *Britannia* first edition, in the account of Somersetshire, it is said of Edgar,

Templa Deo, templis Monachos, Monachis dedit agros.'

But this line from the epitaph of King Edgar, which, by the way, does not occur in the *first* edition of the *Britannia*, merely shews a certain parallelism in form. Warton, however, came curiously near Pope's real source. In the *Britannia*, under 'Hantshire,' Camden quotes certain lines which he attributes to John White, bishop of Winchester (*ob.* 1560),

Templa adimit divis, fora civibus, arva colonis
Rufus, & instituit Beaulensi in rure forestam.
Rex cervum insequitur, Regem vindicta; Tirellus
Non bene provisum transfixit acumine ferri.

With regard to White's poems John Pits, *Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis Tomus Primus*, 1619, p. 763, says of 'Ioannes Vitus,' 'Scripta huius praeclari viri, ipso auctore in vinculis moriente, pene omnia simul perierunt, praeter quaedam carmina' and mentions, p. 764, in a list of his productions, 'Epigrammatum & aliorum Poëmatum Liber vnus. Nubat vt Hispano Regina,' adding 'Vidi aliquando Oxonii MS. exemplar.'

Edward Bensly.

Aberystwyth.

Fielding's Signatures in 'The Champion,' and the Date of his 'Of Good-Nature.'

There seems still to remain some doubt that the papers signed *C* and *L* in *The Champion* of 1739—40 are by Henry Fielding. The following bit of evidence in the matter has, as far as I have been able to learn, not yet been noticed in print.

The first signed paper of *The Champion*, according to the reprint of 1741, is that of November 24, 1739. The signature is the two stars commonly assigned to James Ralph. The next paper, that of November 27, 1739, bears the signature *C*. In it the writer says: 'I should be sorry to think there was in Mankind the Principle pointed at in the following Lines, which I have taken from a Poem not yet communicated to the Public.

> *Nor in the Tyger's Cave, nor Lion's Den,*
> *Dwells our Malignity. For selfish Men,*
> *The Gift of Fame like that of Money deem;*
> *And think they lose, whene'er they give Esteem.'*

The poem referred to is *Of Good-Nature, To his Grace the Duke of Richmond*, the second poem in Volume I of the 1743 edition of Fielding's *Miscellanies*. The next to last paragraph of this poem reads in that edition:

> Dwells there a base Malignity in Men,
> That 'scapes the Tiger's Cave, or Lion's Den?
> Does our Fear dread, or does our Envy hate
> To see another happy, good, or great?
> Or does the Gift of Fame, like Money, seem?
> Think we, we lose, whene'er we give Esteem?

This would indicate that Fielding wrote the first *C* paper. As the 'Advertisement' in the 1741 edition of the collected *Champions* of November 15, 1739—June 19, 1740, states that the essays signed *C* and *L* are the 'Work of one Hand,' we may conclude that this quotation in the first *C* paper goes far to show that Fielding *did* write the *C* and *L* papers.

Further, the quotation demonstrates that Fielding had written at least part of *Of Good-Nature* before November 17, 1739. The form of the quotation as compared with the 1743 text, shows that he revised at least the one paragraph of the poem after November 17, 1739, and before the appearance of the 1743 edition. These facts concerning the poem have not, I believe, as yet been noticed in print.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

BELOIT, WISCONSIN, U.S.A.

ON CERTAIN POEMS OF THE HAWTHORNDEN MSS.

In my article 'Some Unpublished Poems of Drummond from the Hawthornden MSS.,' which appeared in the July number of the *Modern Language Review* (Vol. VI, p. 324), I stated that Drummond was so much in the habit of transcribing passages or entire poems from all kinds of

authors that of the pieces ascribed by me to him one or two might, in spite of the precautions I had taken, turn out not to belong to Drummond. I am now indebted to Professor Grierson for pointing out that of the two poems quoted by me on p. 333, one, 'On a Flye,' belongs to Carew, and the other, 'Prayer going to Bed,' to Thomas Browne (in the *Religio Medici*, Pt II, § XIII). Mr J. T. T. Brown had previously written to me drawing my attention to the fact that the 'Prayer going to Bed' was to be found in Browne's *Religio Medici*. Mr Brown also had doubts concerning the ascription to Drummond of the trifle beginning 'The Gods have heard my vowes' (p. 332 of my article), though he was not able at the time to trace the piece.

I need hardly add that I shall be thankful for any further corrections.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

A NOTE ON TENNYSON'S 'MORTE D'ARTHUR.'

> For so the whole round earth is every way
> Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

Various suggestions have been made as to a literary origin for the metaphor applied to prayer in these lines[1]. None of the similar passages quoted, so far as I know, apply to prayer. The following passage, however, from the *Divine Names* of the Pseudo-Dionysius does furnish the exact parallel.

'Let us then elevate our very selves by our prayers to the higher ascent of the Divine and good rays,—as if a luminous chain being suspended from the celestial heights, and reaching down hither, we, by ever clutching this upwards, first with one hand, and then with the other, seem indeed to draw it down, but in reality we do not draw it down, it being both above and below, but ourselves are carried upwards to the higher splendours of the luminous rays'[2].

[1] Professor Churton Collins (*Illustrations of Tennyson*, London, 1891, p. 158) declared that 'the germ of the two fine lines...is of course to be found in Homer (*Iliad*, VIII, 25—6).' He compares also Plato (*Theaetetus*, CLIII, 10), Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, book I, *ad init.*:—'According to the allegory of the poets...the highest link of nature's chain must needs be tied to the foot of Jupiter's chair';—and Archdeacon Hare's *Sermon on the Law of Self Sacrifice*: 'This is the golden chain of love whereby the whole creation is bound to the throne of the creator.'—Any reminiscence of Plato or Homer in this passage is denied by the present Lord Tennyson on his father's authority (*Poems of Tennyson*, annotated by Alfred, Lord Tennyson, ed. Hallam, Lord Tennyson, London, 1907, I, 389).

[2] *On the Divine Names*, transl. Rev. John Parker, London, 1897, p. 27 f.—Prof. R. M. Jones (*Studies in Mystical Religion*, London, 1909, p. 110, n. 2) remarks that this passage is 'almost certainly a memory of the beautiful passage in Clement of Alexandria (which is apparently from Tertullian, *De Testimonio Animae*).'

It is the easier to believe that Tennyson's metaphor was a reminiscence of the passage here quoted, because Professor Rufus M. Jones has already pointed out[1] other reminiscences of the Pseudo-Dionysius in Tennyson. Mrs Verrall, moreover, has drawn attention to a probable influence of a similar sort in her note on *A Possible Reminiscence of Plotinus in Tennyson*[2].

HOPE EMILY ALLEN.

CAMBRIDGE.

A JEST OF GOLDONI'S IN GOETHE'S 'FAUST.'

Goethe became acquainted with Goldoni's plays when he was a student in Leipzig: several of these were performed during the Easter Fairs, and Goethe refers to one of them in his letter to Behrisch of October 16, 1767. *Gli Impostori*, *Due Gemini*, and *Pamela* were amongst the comedies adapted for the German stage before that date[3], but one of the most charming of all Goldoni's works, *La Locandiera*, was not translated before 1770, when it appeared in the seventh volume of J. H. Saal's collection of the complete works of Goldoni[4]. This translation, *Die Gastwirthin*, was performed three times by Weimar amateurs under Goethe's direction in 1777[5]. Ten years later Goethe witnessed an Italian performance of the same play, and in 1788 he published an account of it of some length in an article contributed to Wieland's *Merkur*, on 'Frauenrollen auf dem römischen Theater von Männern gespielt'[6]. When he resumed his work on *Faust* soon after this date, he evidently remembered the *Locandiera*, and in versifying the scene in Auerbach's Keller he introduced a jest which is not contained in the *Urfaust* of 1775. That he owed it to Goldoni is proved by the use of the foreign word 'judiciren.' In the *Locandiera* a small glass of wine is offered to the Marchese who replies: 'Non tanto piccolo il bicchierino. Il Borgogna non e liquore. Per giudicarne bisogna

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 105, n. 1, p. 107. The references are to the *Ancient Sage* (*passim*), and to *In Memoriam*,

> The Great Intelligences fair
> That range above our mortal state. (LXXXV, st. 6.)

[2] *Modern Language Review*, July, 1907, Vol. II, p. 327 f.

[3] L. Mathar, *Carlo Goldoni auf dem deutschen Theater des XVIII. Jahrhunderts*, Munich Dissertation, 1910.

[4] *Des Herrn Carl Goldoni Sämmtliche Lustspiele*, Leipzig, 1767—77. Cp. Mathar, pp. 180 ff.

[5] *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, IV, p. 114.

[6] Goethe's *Werke* (Weimar Ed.), XLVII, pp. 273 ff.

beverne a sufficienza.' In *Faust* Frosch answers Mephistopheles, who gives his own wine to the students:

> Schafft Ihr ein gutes Glas, so wollen wir Euch loben.
> Nur gebt nicht gar zu kleine Proben;
> Denn wenn ich judiciren soll,
> Verlang' ich auch das Maul recht voll.

ROBERT PETSCH.

LIVERPOOL.

METTRE AU RANCART.

I have looked in vain for a satisfactory etymology of this expression. I suggest that *rancart* may be a dialectal corruption of *hangar*. Observant people who have travelled in Normandy and conversed with the peasants must have noticed that initial *h* is so strongly aspirated (or rather expirated) as to resemble a German *h*. In certain districts, notably in and around Caen, and in the 'Vallée d'Auge' this aspiration has become so strong as to cause a vibration of the uvula, resulting in a decided palatal *r* (see Nyrop, Vol. I, § 487). At Pont l'Evêque, 'la haie,' 'le houx,' 'le hangar' are commonly pronounced *la rée, le rou, le rankar*, and friends of mine who are natives of Calvados confirm the accuracy of my impression. The sense of the phrase points in the same direction, for the *hangar* is the place where objects or implements not in actual use would naturally be put away.

H. E. BERTHON.

OXFORD.

DISCUSSIONS.

Piers Plowman, One or Five.

Having only just found time to read the latest developments of this discussion in the *Modern Language Review*, may I speak a word for the many who are perfectly willing to admit Prof. Manly's theory upon adequate evidence, but who feel at every fresh turn the inconclusiveness of what has hitherto been alleged? Mr Chambers seems to have shown conclusively that the argument from linguistic and metrical differences is (to say the least) premature; he has also given a clear and closely-reasoned exposition of what many of us had dimly felt all along, that Sloth's confession and the names of the wife and children might quite well stand where they are. But Dr Bradley, while admitting much of the force of these arguments, still insists upon 'the curious irrelevance of B's confession of Wrath.' He apparently feels, with Prof. Manly, that this 'contains no very distinctive traits of Wrath,' but might almost as well be Envy. Yet I cannot help thinking that all this rests upon a misapprehension of medieval facts as definite and as fatal as the misapprehension (now admitted) of that crucial word *win*.

Prof. Manly's objection seems exaggerated even on the surface. B's personal description of Wrath, with which he quarrels, is exactly that of a man in bestial anger, showing the whites of his eyes and grinning like a dog, with lowered head ready for attack[1]. We ourselves may easily live a polite threescore years and ten without ever seeing these things; but nobody doubts that B (whether separable or inseparable from A and C) was familiar with elemental and unvarnished humanity. Again, even on the surface it is obvious that he who impels nuns to jangle with their tongues, and to proceed through 'thou liest and thou liest' to actual fisticuffs and potential murder, can scarcely be other than Wrath. So far, then, B's description answers to the name he gave it, and cannot without violence be transferred to Envy. But the further objection seems to rest upon a more subtle misapprehension.

[1] Cf. Darwin, *Expression of the Emotions*, chap. x. 'Anger'; 'The dilated nostrils quiver'; 'According to Gratiolet, the pupils are always contracted in rage'; 'Eyes dilated ...head inclined forwards'; 'This protrusion of the head and body seems a common gesture with the enraged.' In chapter xi., on the other hand, Darwin confesses himself unable to give Envy 'any fixed expression, sufficiently distinct to be described or delineated.'

Prof. Manly and Dr Bradley, both writing under necessary pressure of space, seem briefly to hint at what Dr Furnivall plainly expressed, that our direct and powerful A would not so have beaten about the bush; *his* Wrath would not have been content to fritter away his energies among mere monks and nuns, when he might have done so much more harm in the wide world outside. No philologist of our own day would have thus expressed Wrath; therefore poor B of five hundred years ago, who wrestled daily with things rather than with words, and had to bring his thoughts to birth as best he could, stands condemned as a blunderer.

I contend, on the contrary, that it would scarcely have been possible to choose any better field for Wrath in the fourteenth century England —any field in which he could have worked more freely or caused more scandal. Apart from that eternal and world-wide dispute between the Friars and the secular clergy to which B refers, the intestine quarrels of the Religious were frequent and inevitable—is it not notorious, for instance, that the daily routine of monotonous privations among the same small company sometimes stretches the patience of modern Arctic explorers almost beyond human endurance? Indications of this kind are so common in monastic records, and so obvious when once realized, that I have long ceased to keep notes of them; but a post-graduate prize-essay has lately been written here in which the author (Mr R. H. Snape, of Emmanuel) is so struck by the frequent records of monastic quarrels in episcopal visitations, that he seeks to account for them by a theory of his own, which of course need not concern us here. Again, taking down almost at random a famous book on monastic discipline (the *Speculum Disciplinae* long attributed to St Bonaventura, but really written by his secretary, Bernard of Besse), I find the following passage (Pars II, c. vi. § 7): 'Hence it befalleth that we see many [Religious] who contemn the greatest things [in the world] for Christ's sake, yet still keep the old Adam in the smallest things, and are moved to wrath for a writing-stylus, for a needle, for a pen. They are lightly provoked and puffed up, as men who possess not apostolic charity.' This passage supplies both the points we need to justify B; (1) the frequency of the phenomenon, and (2) the force which it derived, for moral purposes, from its inconsistency with the monastic ideal and the scandal which it gave to the world at large. Gower, in his *Vox Clamantis*, IV. 169 ff., dwells emphatically on the wordy wars that went on in monasteries; even when the rule of silence compelled the monks to talk on their fingers, then 'loquax digitus...in rixis plus meretrice furit.' Cf. the 'Frater Odium' of l. 1103 below. Moreover, Etienne de Bourbon, going similarly through the Seven Deadly Sins, gives only two anecdotes of Wrath proper, the first of which refers to a Béguine 'so wrathful and quarrelsome that she frequently afflicted and disturbed the rest *by her many revilings*.' Neither here nor in the next story does Etienne take his wrathful people beyond 'thou liest and thou liest': to him, the picture was complete even without those buffetings and murderous desires which Prof. Manly so strangely blinks in B. Yet Etienne was

a preacher of remarkable force and success, who knew the world of his time inside and out.

But Dr Bradley holds that 'the omissions and alterations of the C-text considerably lessen the inappropriateness of the confession.' So far as this is so, C does not here show himself so blundering as we are sometimes told. But let us look into details. (*a*) C's one addition of importance, at the beginning, does indeed *broaden* the picture considerably; but it does not in the least imply that C found in B that want of *concentrated* force which (it is now contended) shows him to have been a different man from A. On the contrary, C's quarrel with B's picture (if quarrel there was) was precisely with its narrowness and concentration. (*b*) C's main omission, again, does not bear out Dr Bradley's contention; he omits the sentence in which B describes the revelation of sacramental confession as a possible effect of Wrath. His object in this omission was, *ex hypothesi*, to remove one of B's traits which was 'more suitable to Envy than to Wrath.' But, though we all know that the seal of confession was fairly frequently broken in the Middle Ages, yet the temporal and spiritual consequences of such a crime were so serious and so well known that few were likely to blab in cold blood. For one priest who broke the seal of confession because Envy gnawed at his breast, we may fairly assume that ten did so under the 'brevis furor' of Wrath. Therefore, whatever may have been the motive of C's omission, it can scarcely have been that which Dr Bradley implies. As to the other changes which he emphasizes, but without specification, I would only plead Prof. Manly's words 'B's wrath he [C] leaves with little change' (*E.E.T.S.* 139 c. 27 or 109). And, to avoid all misapprehension, may I conclude by echoing the gratitude already expressed by others to Prof. Manly for having inaugurated this new stage in the criticism of *Piers Plowman*?

G. G. Coulton.

Cambridge.

REVIEWS.

The Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by A. W. WARD and A. R. WALLER. Vol. VI. The Drama to 1642. Cambridge: University Press. 1910. 8vo. x + 533 pp.

IN the review devoted to the fifth volume of this invaluable work, and published in the July number of *The Modern Language Review*, the space demanded for a due consideration of the chapters on Shakespeare necessitated a postponement of our review of the last two chapters of that volume. These chapters concern 'the lesser Elizabethans' (using the last word strictly), and the social and political conditions of the reign in their influences on the drama. In the former Mr Ronald Bayne has cleared up much that we know only from the confused accounts and memoranda of Henslowe. It is worth recognising, for example, that there were no 'lesser dramatists' in the Greene-Marlowe group: 'The lesser dramatist is the result of the extraordinary interest in the drama which these authors created': and further that 'we have to wait some years before the work of lesser writers survives sufficiently to enable us to appraise it.' Nevertheless Munday, Chettle, Haughton, Porter and others, humbler workers in Henslowe's mart of theatrical trade, assume position and character under Mr Bayne's hand, and the touch of their work with that of greater men is skilfully suggested. We are glad to find the robust vigour of Porter's *Two Angry Women of Abington* rated at its true value, and welcome the hint as to its probable influence on Jonson. In the final chapter of the fifth volume Dr Ward brings together with grasp and discernment the political and social aspects of the age as affecting the stage, marking the conditions in which the Elizabethan drama reached its height and contrasting them with the symptoms of what was to come.

Turning to the sixth volume, we find Professor Thorndike leading off with an adequate and orthodox account of Jonson and his work, in which he properly distinguishes (as it has not always been distinguished) the quality of the poet's avowed classicism, and happily attributes to his 'impeding garrulity' and 'absence of charm,' the circumstance that the judicious (whose opinion alone Jonson did not disdain) lend an intellectual assent to the poet's literary qualities, but warm only to the man. Jonson's development from romantic drama into the comedy of humours, which became his forte, is well brought out; and

Professor Thorndike refuses to follow Creizenach in his denial to Jonson's authorship the brilliant 'additions' to *The Spanish Tragedy*. Nor is the second chapter on Chapman, Marston and Dekker by Professor Dixon less informing and satisfactory. The vital defect of Chapman's dramatic art is touched in the words 'he never learned to think in any character but his own'; the personal character of Marston is rescued, with much show of justice, from the critical obloquy under which it has often suffered; and the enduring poetic charm of Dekker and especially the essentially English quality of his art is recognised to the full. We could wish greater attention to have been paid to Mr Robertson's recent discussion of *Alphonsus of Germany*, with his denial of the authorship of it to Chapman[1]; and the alleged collaboration of Chapman with Shirley in *Chabot* and *The Ball*, slender as is the evidence, deserves perhaps a fuller treatment. Is it Shirley's hand that gives to the former effective play not only its clarity of plot and directness, but that power of pathos which Professor Dixon justly denies to Chapman elsewhere?

The separation of the qualities that mark the lithe and supple genius of Middleton from the grosser yet essentially larger nature of Rowley in works of their joint authorship has already formed the subject of scholarly comparison; but never has this distinction been so effectively drawn and with such a fine feeling for its subtleties as in the chapter by Mr Symons on these poets. The swiftness and sureness of Middleton in his verse as in his prose; how Rowley, less articulate, but infinitely more imaginative and therefore truer to the verities of life, lifted the range of Middleton's vision and humanised his art, all this and much more of this interesting collaboration is set forth with admirable critical discernment. Withal Mr Symons seems scarcely just to Rowley's rare play, *A Shoemaker a Gentleman*, now accessible in reprint together with his forcible and sincere, if overdone, *All's Lost by Lust*[2]. In the fourth chapter the long and chequered dramatic career of Heywood is followed by Dr Ward, and his primacy in the domestic drama, together with his estimable modesty as a man and a playwright, is duly emphasized. Particularly interesting is the critic's justification of the credibility of the author in his famous statement that he had 'either an entire hand or at the least a main finger' in two hundred and twenty plays. Features of Mr Macaulay's treatment of Beaumont and Fletcher which follows are his excellent contrast of the versification and poetic manner of Fletcher and Shakespeare; his showing more clearly than heretofore how Fletcher was the innovator, while Beaumont was more distinctly in affinity with the older Elizabethan school; and his recognition in Massinger of a capacity superior to Fletcher's in the conduct of an entire plot, however happy Fletcher may be in the management of single scenes. In view of the preternatural

[1] *Did Shakespeare Write "Titus Andronicus"?* pp. 123 sq.

[2] *William Rowley his 'All's Lost by Lust' and 'A Shoemaker a Gentleman' with an Introduction on Rowley's place in the drama*, by C. W. Stork, *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*, XIII. 1910.

precision with which some critics of late have assured us that at such and such a line Beaumont laid down the pen and Fletcher took it up, it is refreshing to read from one so long experienced in these vexed questions, 'When a critic, with no external evidence of authorship before him, concludes that a certain play was originally written by Beaumont, afterwards revised by Fletcher and finally rewritten by Middleton, he is evidently dealing in mere guesswork.' Suggestive, too, is the conclusion: 'It is probable that the popularity of Beaumont and Fletcher on the stage in the latter part of the century, together with the acceptance of their language by Dryden as a standard of pure English, had more influence than is commonly acknowledged upon the development of English style during that period in the direction of classical simplicity.'

Professor Koeppel's presentation of the dramatic art of Massinger is as able as it is thorough. After setting forth the somewhat intricate relations of the poet to the Pembroke family, chief hereditary patrons of the poets, the author summarizes in several direct paragraphs the quality of Massinger's excellent dramatic art, and especially the nature and the limitations of his power to draw character. To the alleged cases of Massinger's apparent sympathy with the Roman form of worship might well be added the figure of the efficient and beneficent Jesuit, Francesco, in *The Renegado*. Perhaps it might be asked, if Massinger's 'use of alliteration is very discreet,' how can it be likewise 'in most cases undoubtedly unconscious'? And why mention 'tricks of the euphuistic style,' even to note their absence in a poet who did not begin to write until this aberration of style in prose and of strictly Elizabethan times had become a thing of the past for a generation? It cannot be that a critic of Professor Koeppel's eminence and nationality could be infected by the loose and unscientific employment of this word which, in a recent notable history of English poetry, dubs a whole generation of writers 'poetical euphuists.'

Of Cyril Tourneur, if Professor Vaughan will pardon us, we really know a little more than 'the dates at which his plays and poems were published.' He appears to have been a son or at least a relative of Captain Richard Turner, 'water-bailiff of Brill,' and spent several years in the Low Countries, acting temporarily as secretary to the council of war on the occasion of the expedition of 1625 to Cadiz[1]. As to the two tragedies that custom has associated with his name, their difference in quality, design and character of diction is such that we should prefer to raise the question of the possibility of one man's authorship of them both, rather than remain content, as does Professor Vaughan, with this difference for determining priority in composition. Professor Vaughan has not done justice to these extraordinary plays by his remark that the characters for the most part are 'either puppets or incarnate abstractions of various virtues and vices.' Nor do we feel

[1] G. Goodwin, *The Academy*, May 9, 1891, p. 442, and the references there given to the *Calendar of State Papers*.

more satisfied with the suggestion that the *Northward, Eastward* and *Westward Hoe* series is to be regarded mainly as an 'afterswell' of the famous war of the theatres. Quicksilver, in *Eastward Hoe*, with his pranks and his conversion, is a capital take-off of the whole class of idle apprentices of the day, and the entire play is gently satirical of the city. The other two comedies belong to the Middletonian species, and needed no allusion to excellent old Chapman to make up their coarse conventional merriment. While Professor Vaughan was looking for satirical allusions, why did he omit the good natured gibes at *Hamlet* in *Eastward Hoe*? We are glad, in view of these little 'dissensions,' to commend the adequate treatment of the difficult subject of Webster with which this chapter concludes: for however the other greater dramatists rise into success at times in their poetry, their characterization, or in the handling of the plot, Webster alone with Shakespeare attained that sense of a depth beyond, dominated by an impenetrable tragic gloom, which gives his two master tragedies their place among the highest triumphs of the romantic conception of life.

In the eighth chapter on Ford and Shirley Professor Neilson begins with an excellent distinction. Recalling the publication of the folio of Shakespeare in 1623, he finds that previous playwrights have been students of the playhouse, but these for the first time students of literary drama. The remark is of course truer of Ford than of Shirley, whose touch with the stage remained to the end close and intimate; but indubitably there is a literary air about the drama of the time of King Charles that does not belong to the stage in the days of his predecessors. Professor Neilson's treatment of Ford suggests the growth of the dramatist's romantic unorthodoxy with regard to the tyrant passion love and the subtle casuistry with which he defends it, and refers his plays to a larger number of sources and influences, it may be surmised, than Ford, who was emulous of originality, would himself have confessed or perhaps even have recognized. It would be interesting to know more of Mr Sherman's surmise (in an unpublished thesis, which the present reviewer has not seen) that *Volpone* may have influenced *The Fancies, Chaste* and *Noble*, or how the philandering of Gascoigne's *Ferdinando Jeronimi*, which is pure comedy, could have affected the intricate, serious motive of *Love's Sacrifice*. Professor Neilson's treatment of Shirley is eminently fair and sound. Conventional with all his ingenuity was Shirley, and resonant with echoes of the great drama of the past, but it is difficult to prove him decadent. There is an unobtrusive wholesomeness about him and his competent art which falls into contrast alike with the rhetorical Massinger and the hectic Ford.

And now having traversed this great drama, leaping from peak to peak, with a cheerful disregard for things below, we descend to the 'lesser Jacobean and Caroline dramatists': unhappy adjectives that, unlike Elizabethan, denote only the accidents of time. It is difficult to follow Mr Bayne in his idea that Day in his *Ile of Gulls* created 'a new dramatic type.' Happier, it would seem, is his reference of Day's light

art in comedy to the impulse of Lyly, with suggestion, so far as he could follow it, from Shakespearean comedy. The comparison, too, of Lyly's lyrics, the epigrammatic flavour of which is the best argument against depriving him of them, to those of Herrick seems unhappily wide of the mark. This chapter with its enumeration of names and brief words of characterization is perhaps as well done as the impracticable conditions of the problem would permit. Let us think of political history or any other subject, written on this impossible plan. The biographies and deeds of the kings and greater men, written up in chronologically consecutive chapters, and then all the lesser things gathered together. The doings and campaigns of the great Caesars in eight chapters, the ninth on the City of Rome, the tenth on plebeians and patricians, the last on art and coinage. The present reviewer has no desire to be captious, but he feels that no true picture of the trend and development of our great drama can be received where the method is that of successive printing in several colours, first all the blacks, then all the reds, then all the greens, yellows and blues, each changing, and modifying the whole picture which must be held provisionally in mind until the last block comes from the press. Here in the tenth chapter of a second volume on the drama up to 1642 we first reach an account of the Elizabethan stage and the constitutions of the old theatrical companies; and the historic quarrel between the city and the court, which so deeply affected the course of things theatrical, especially in very early times, is reserved for a final chapter. Possibly these defects are inseparable from the cooperative plan which has none the less much to recommend it; and yet apparently the history of literature is the only subject that remains tethered to biography and the chronology of accidental publication.

Returning to our immediate business, it would be difficult to find a more temperate and informing chapter than that of Mr Child on The Elizabethan Theatre. We could wish that there were space to expatiate on its capable use of the most recent material and its many other good points. Professor Manly's contribution, too, an account of the Chapel Royal, puts in order a subject hitherto in great confusion and little correlated in its true significance to the history of the drama. We are glad to find the author taking a negative view of Professor Wallace's idea that Queen Elizabeth actually established and maintained a theatrical company in the Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars. But why cast 'historic doubts' on Thomas Preston and his authorship of *Cambyses*? Better men than Preston did not disdain to use the drama in academic wise and Preston with all his honours upon him belonged precisely to the class of Gager, Legge, Gwinne and the rest.

In the scholarly chapter (XII) by Professor Boas on University Plays we have a genuine contribution to an interesting subject, until lately not consecutively treated nor otherwise than sporadically investigated. Many of the academic dramas mentioned in this chapter are set forth as to their contents and character for the first time and the proportion and development of the subject are happily preserved. Professor Boas

has used effectively, too, the recent contributions to this subject, especially those of Professor Moore Smith, who has made the field of the English Latin drama his own. The chapter on the masque once more by Mr Bayne, offers several suggestive points. Among them the essentially non-dramatic character of the masque as such; the existence of the antimasque, despite Jonson, implicit in the masque from the first; and above all the example of Spenser in the creation of a visual, beautiful unreal world, precisely that in which the masque with its allegory and mythology was subsequently to revel. Happy is the designation of Jonson's genius in the masque as 'Aristophanic' in its 'combination of robust naturalism and imaginative fancy'; and the full recognition accorded to that great master for the admirable quality of his comic vein in the masque is as just as it is novel. With a well-considered chapter on the Puritan attack upon the stage, by Mr J. Dover Wilson, beginning in the Middle Ages and extending to the closing of the theatres, the sixth volume concludes.

In a review necessarily made up of such a multiplicity of detail, where facts jostle theories (even if theories do not jostle facts) and argument treads on the heels of criticism, it is impossible to do adequate justice to the many and genuine merits of this work. Despite a general plan that sacrifices much to the object of getting things together under a biographical title or a generally inclusive one, such as 'Political and Social Aspects,' 'The Children of the Chapel,' 'The Puritan Attack upon the Stage,' the editors have succeeded in giving a surprising degree of equality to the diverse contributions; and the tendency of the specialist to assume a knowledge of his facts in order to gain space for his theories has been judiciously curbed. Nothing but praise, too, is to be bestowed upon the carefully prepared bibliographies and incidental appendices. Altogether it is a fortunate augury for the future of scholarship that a work, enlisting the cooperation of Germany, France and America, wherever the torch of English learning is upheld, should thus proceed in its successful progress towards completion.

F. E. Schelling.

Philadelphia.

Shakespeare's Roman Plays and their Background. By M. W. MacCallum. London: Macmillan. 1910. 8vo. xvi + 666 pp.

The general merits of Professor MacCallum's volume—its comprehensive survey of its subject, its sound scholarship, its lucid and attractive style, its skilful analysis of character—have already been widely recognised by reviewers and by students. It will therefore be advisable in the present notice not to enlarge upon these points, but to deal mainly with some features of the work which are perhaps specially suitable for discussion in the pages of *The Modern Language Review.*

I am glad to see that in his Preface Dr MacCallum makes so handsome an acknowledgement of his indebtedness to F. A. T. Kreyssig,

'one of the sanest and most suggestive expositors that Shakespeare has ever had.' The tribute is well deserved, and it has been a real loss to Shakespearian study in England that Kreyssig's lectures have never been translated. To other commentators, both English and foreign, Dr MacCallum makes frequent and appreciative reference, and in the main he has succeeded in keeping 'abreast of the literature on the subject.' But there is one surprising omission in the list of authorities from which he quotes. More than thirty years ago Prof. Paul Stapfer wrote *Shakespeare et l'Antiquité*, which was 'crowned' by the French Academy, and of which the first Part, 'Greek and Latin Antiquity as presented in Shakespeare's Plays,' was translated by Emily Carey in 1880. The last ten chapters of this work discuss Shakespeare's relation to Plutarch and the chief characters in the Roman History plays. They anticipate in their method and spirit the treatment of these subjects in Prof. MacCallum's volume, though the scale is much narrower, and the psychological analysis far less subtle. Has Stapfer's work escaped the Australian Professor's notice? Or did he think that in the light of his own more comprehensive treatment no reference to it was needed?

To some readers the most interesting part of Dr MacCallum's work will be the 'Introduction,' 167 pages in length, which forms almost a fourth of the volume. The section on 'Roman Plays in the Sixteenth Century' includes an illuminating discussion of the plays of the French Senecans, Muretus, Jodelle, Grévin, and Garnier. The connection between the *Julius Caesar* of Muretus, the *César* of Grévin and the *Cornélie* of Garnier is clearly traced. The filiation is especially important because Kyd translated *Cornélie* in 1594, and internal evidence suggests that Kyd's version in its turn influenced Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. On this point Dr MacCallum adopts a peculiar attitude. He recognises that the dialogue between Cassius and Marcus Brutus in Shakespeare's play, Act I, Scene 2, resembles in 'its whole tone and direction' that between Cassius and Decimus Brutus in *Cornélie*, Act IV, Scene 1, and that there is nothing at all similar in Plutarch. He even in his Appendix A quotes the nearest parallels between the plays, both in the French and the English versions, yet he concludes that 'the grounds for believing that Shakespeare...was influenced by Garnier's *Cornélie*...are even at the best precarious' (p. 61). This seems to me to understate the case in favour of the Garnier-Kyd influence upon the great dramatist. Shakespeare's Cassius throughout is so much more akin to the Cassius of Garnier than of Plutarch, that it is difficult to believe that the resemblance is accidental. It is more reasonable to suppose that Shakespeare's library contained *Cornelia*, which in the year of its publication by Kyd, 1594, was coupled by an elegist with the Stratford poet's *Lucrece*.

It is curious, with Dr MacCallum's keen interest in the neo-Senecan precursors of the Shakespearian Roman plays that he should apparently not have heard of the anonymous academic drama, *The Tragedie of Caesar and Pompey or Caesars Revenge*, acted at Trinity College, Oxford. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on June 5, 1606,

and two editions are extant, one undated (but probably the earlier), the other dated 1607. Internal evidence of style proves unmistakeably, in my opinion, that this play belongs to the last decade of the sixteenth century, and that Prof. Parrott in his interesting article upon it (*Mod. Lang. Review*, Vol. v, No. 4) is mistaken in thinking that it was composed in 1606. As the first Act is reprinted in the current *Shakspere Jahrbuch*, and as the full text is on the point of being issued by the Malone Society, it will soon be accessible to scholars, and they will be able to form their own views. Can Shakespeare on his visit to Oxford, when *Hamlet* was performed, have heard of the Trinity play, and was he thinking of it when Polonius in Act III, Sc. 2 says of his acting at the University: 'I did enact Julius Caesar: I was killed i' the Capitol; Brutus killed me'? However this may be, he is not likely to have seen it in manuscript, and there is not the faintest trace of it having influenced his own *Julius Caesar*.

But whether Shakespeare in his Roman plays owed anything or nothing to earlier dramatists, their true 'ancestry' as Prof. MacCallum, of course, shows, is to be sought in Plutarch—Amyot—North. His discussion of the relation of the Greek, French, and English versions of *The Parallel Lives* to one another is admirable. Even to serious Shakespearian students Amyot is apt to be a somewhat shadowy figure. The account here given of his career and character, of his scholarly enthusiasm and limitations, of his importance in the development of French prose, is highly illuminating. Such a passage as the following may be quoted in illustration of Dr MacCallum's style and critical method:

> Amyot could not on account of his position deliver a facsimile of the Greek. Plutarch lived at the close of an epoch, he at the beginning. The one employed a language full of reminiscences and past its prime; the other, a language that was just reaching self-consciousness and that had the future before it....At the worst Plutarch's style becomes mannered and Amyot's infantile. By no sleight of hand would it have been possible to give in the French of the sixteenth century an exact reproduction of the Greek of the second. Grey-haired antiquity had to learn the accents of stammering childhood[1].

Equally penetrating is the study of North's relation to Amyot. After pointing out the deficiencies of the Englishman's version as compared with that of his French original, Prof. MacCallum redresses the balance in North's favour as follows:

> He may be more licentious than Amyot in his treatment of grammar, and less perspicuous in the ordering of his clauses, but he is equal to him or superior in word music after the English mode; and he is even richer in full-blooded words and in phrases racy of the soil. Not that he ever rejects the guidance of his master, but it leads him to the high places and the secret places of his own language.

[1] Another, less elaborate, study of Amyot's work and his relation to Plutarch and to North appeared a little later than Prof. MacCallum's, in Sir Sidney Lee's *The French Renaissance in England*. Attention is there called to a monograph by M. René Sturel entitled *Jaques Amyot, traducteur des Vies parallèles de Plutarque* (1908). This treatise probably did not come into Prof. MacCallum's hands, as he does not mention it.

The vernacular character of his diction gave a national hue to his subject, and he thus 'supplied Shakespeare with the only Plutarch that Shakespeare could understand.' The dramatist in his three Roman plays borrowed, in varying quantities, the diction of North and the subject-matter of Plutarch. Hence in *Antony and Cleopatra* there is 'a maximum of Plutarch and a minimum of North'; in *Coriolanus*, 'the maximum of North with the minimum of Plutarch'; in *Julius Caesar*, 'the mean influence of both Plutarch and North.'

All this is in a general way known to Shakespearian students. But nowhere, as far as I am aware, is the problem handled with such precision, delicacy, and insight as in this chapter, which is, to my mind, the most masterly section of the whole work.

Even when he gets to his main task, the discussion in detail of the three Roman plays, Dr MacCallum is at his best when he is dealing with the larger aspects of the subject. Shakespeare's transmutation of his material in *Julius Caesar*, the position of *Antony and Cleopatra* and the union in it of a history, tragedy, and love poem, the situation in Rome in *Coriolanus* as represented by Plutarch and the dramatist respectively—topics such as these are handled with refreshing vigour and subtlety. The criticism has here a breadth and spaciousness worthy of its themes. And there are incidental phrases that stick in one's memory such as 'the flame-tipped welter of *Titus Andronicus*, the poignant radiance of *Romeo and Juliet*.'

But Dr MacCallum's critical method is, in my opinion, less successful when employed in elaborate dissection of individual characters. It is not that he fails either in erudition or in psychological insight—far from it. But he goes into such minute detail that our interest tends to become absorbed in the process of interpretation instead of in the personages themselves. Thus he takes twenty pages to expound what is essentially the same view of 'the titular hero' in *Julius Caesar* as Prof. Dowden sets forth in four pages of *Shakespeare's Mind and Art*. The cumulative effect of the long-drawn-out studies of the isolated characters is to make us forget at times that we are dealing with plays at all. We do not expect in a work like this disquisitions on the technicalities of (say) the platform-stage, but we are justified in reminding the critic that Roman plays have as their 'background' (to use his own phrase) not only North's *Plutarch*, but the Elizabethan theatre. His failure to take this fact sufficiently into account tempts him to attach too much significance to speeches and actions which were conditioned not by literary or ethical but by theatrical considerations.

Nevertheless the volume, as a whole, is one of the most stimulating additions made in recent years to Shakespearian literature. It is to be hoped that the author will not delay in following it with his projected supplement on the treatment of the Roman play in England by Shakespeare's younger contemporaries and Caroline successors.

F. S. Boas.

London.

Spenser's Minor Poems. Edited by ERNEST DE SÉLINCOURT. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. xxxii + 528 pp.

This is the companion volume to Mr J. C. Smith's edition of the *Faerie Queene*, published in 1909, and completes the Oxford edition of Spenser's Poetical Works. It goes far to supply for the first time a satisfactory text of Spenser's Minor Poems, that is to say, a text which is not only sound in itself, but which is accompanied by such full information with regard to the readings of the early authorities, that the reader can use his own judgment, and test that of the editor, almost as well as if he had the originals before him. This is far from being the case with the previous editions. Morris gives a very accurate text on the whole in the Globe edition, but his critical notes leave much to be desired. In the *Shepheardes Calender*, for example, he has before him apparently two only of the five quartos, the first and the fifth, though he occasionally cites also the readings of others, and the folio of 1611, and his selection of various readings from these is quite arbitrary, so that nothing can be inferred from his silence. For example, in the February eclogue, l. 8, he reads 'Perke as a Peacock' and fails to note that the first quarto has 'Perke as Peacock'; in l. 21 he makes no mention of the reading 'Ne never,' which is that of the fifth quarto and the folio; in l. 137 he omits to mention the alteration of the folio; in l. 176 he rightly gives 'woundes' in the text, but omits to mention that the quartos and the folio have 'wounds'; and so on. For various reasons also the editions of Todd, Child, Collier and Grosart are either untrustworthy or unsatisfactory.

'The aim of this volume,' says the editor, 'is to present a trustworthy text of the Minor Poems of Spenser, based upon a collation of the editions published in the poet's lifetime with the Folio of 1611.' The text is based in each case upon that of the first edition published, the only one which we can be sure was in direct contact with the author's handwriting, and every deviation from the text of these first editions is supposed to be recorded in the footnotes. With regard to the other editions the editor proposes to note every verbal change, and all those variations in spelling and punctuation which seem really significant, but he has rightly refrained from overloading his notes with an accumulation of orthographical variants of no interest, which would have made it difficult for the reader to obtain the information which he really requires. In the case of most of the poems the editor has to deal only with a single early edition and the folio of 1611, but of *Daphnaida* there are two quartos, and of the *Shepheardes Calender* no fewer than five, to be collated. The tale which is unfolded by the history of the text of the last-named poem is the familiar one of gradual degeneration, each edition being printed from the preceding one, with some few corrections, but a greater number of added errors, and there is the usual absence of all effective supervision by the author (excusable in Spenser's case, for he was for the most part in Ireland) and of all systematic reference to earlier editions than that from which the

printers were working. In happy unconsciousness of their own errors, and acutely aware of the fact that they were correcting some of the mistakes of their predecessors, they always imagined apparently that continuous progress was being made towards perfection; and when they found an obvious error, they preferred to correct it by conjecture, rather than to refer to the first edition, where in most cases the author's own text might have been found. This does not mean that corrections in a later edition are never taken from earlier ones, but there was no systematic reference back, and for the most part no correction by the author, though an occasional suggestion probably came from him sometimes. In the *Shepheardes Calender*, for example, the emendation in the third quarto of 'overcrawed' for 'overawed' (Feb. 142) must surely have come from the author; in the fifth quarto the correction 'wrethed' for 'wretched' (May 186) points perhaps to a consultation of the first or the second quarto[1], and in the folio such readings as 'sithes' for 'sighes' (Jan. 49), 'followe' (June 75), 'yclad' for 'clad' (Nov. 113), 'she sweeter' for 'sweeter' (Aug. 72), suggest a similar conclusion, though in a multitude of other cases the misreadings found in the fifth quarto were accepted by the editor of the folio without reference to earlier editions. Professor de Sélincourt ought not, I think, to say with reference to the *Shepheardes Calender* that 'F often preferred conjecture to research'; the remark is not justified by the instances which he gives, one of which appears to be mistaken and the other is probably only a misprint, and there are in fact very few cases in which the editor of the folio alters by independent conjecture, where he could have obtained the true reading from an earlier edition. One example however is Aug. 18, where the reading of the fifth quarto 'may plaine' is mended into 'my plaint' instead of 'my payne' as given in the first two quartos. In several instances where all the quartos are wrong the conjectures of the folio editor (if they be conjectures only) are excellent, e.g. March 4 'nigheth,' June 16 'shroud,' Aug. 84 'thy,' Sept. 145 'yead,' Nov. 78 'made you,' which last surely ought to be accepted into the text.

In connexion with these corrections we may be disposed to attribute some original authority to the folio, such as the 1609 edition of the *Faerie Queene* possessed (at least so far as regards the added cantos), and if this be so, we may be inclined to regard some other alterations as authoritative, for example those in the *Ruines of Time*, 447—455.

Professor de Sélincourt's review of the editions of Spenser 'from 1617—1884' is interesting and judicial. He should have entitled it 'On the Text of Spenser from 1617—1908,' for he includes, rather at the last moment, the edition by Professor Neil Dodge (reviewed in the *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, July 1909). It is fortunate perhaps that his attention was called to this before publication, because some surprise was felt on

[1] This change, however, is put down by the editor in the Introduction (p. xvi) to the credit of the folio, and the reader has no means of knowing whether the statement of the critical footnote or that of the Introduction is correct. As a matter of fact the footnote is right in this instance.

the other side of the water that no mention should have been made of this in Mr J. C. Smith's edition of the *Faerie Queene*, and it is sometimes felt with justice that the excellent work done by Americans in English literature is not so speedily recognised in this country as it should be.

The value of a book like this depends of course mainly upon the accuracy of the collations, and it is therefore the reviewer's duty to test this to some extent. Professor de Sélincourt, who is humane in his remarks upon the mistakes of earlier editors, will not be surprised probably to learn that his own work has some errors. In fact there are rather too many; and it is a pity that some of them were not removed by a more careful revision. The present reviewer has had before him the folio of 1611, the third quarto (1586) of the *Shepheardes Calender*, and the quarto (1590) of *Muiopotmos*, and he has roughly collated the text of the last-named poem and of the eclogues for January, March, April, September, October, November, December in the *Shepheardes Calender*. The following are places where errors have been found in Professor de Sélincourt's text or notes:

Shepheardes Calender, April, l. 8. The text has 'thriftye' without note of variation. This is no doubt a misprint for 'thristye,' the reading of the first quarto. It is 'thirstie' in Q_3 and *F*. 31 gaze Q_3. 148 his way *F*. September, l. 25 woe Q_3 *F*. (This is also the reading of Q_4.) 54 blast Q_3 (*also* Q_4). 64 diddest Q_3 *F*. 195 wide *om. F*. 218 mans *F*. October, l. 80 not *F*. November, l. 28 foolerie? *F*. 49 chose Q_3 *F* (this ought to be noted, I think). 115 coloured Q_3 *F* (the editor's footnote here is inconsistent with his note on p. 514). 197 God *F*. December, l. 19, youthfull spring *F*.

Muiopotmos, l. 54 lustiehed *F*. 412 tunes *Q F* (the reading 'runes' in the text must of course be a misprint, and it is a very bad one). 431 yonthly *F*. Probably the true reading is 'yongthly.' It may be noted here that the readings of the Camb. Univ. quarto of *Muiopotmos* in ll. 250, 354, 370 agree with those of the Huth copy.

A few further points which suggest remark may be taken as they come in the book.

Introduction, p. xvi. The statements about the text of *Sh. Cal.* May 186, and of the October Gloss, are inconsistent with those of the critical footnotes.

Ib., pp. xxii, xxiv. We feel in private duty bound to observe upon the inaccurate forms of reference used by the editor with regard to this Review. He calls it first the *Modern Languages Quarterly* and then the *Modern Languages Review*. Neither title is correct.

p. 160. *Teares of the Muses*, l. 232. I suspect that 'singulfs' is what Spenser wrote here, and in the three other places where the word occurs, *Colin Clout*, l. 168, *Faerie Queene*, III. xi. 12, and V. vi. 13. Surely there cannot be a printer's error in every case. After all 'singulf' is in itself a more satisfactory word than 'singult,' though etymologically incorrect, and the changes produce a very inharmonious effect.

p. 202, *Mother Hubberds Tale*, l. 185. The alteration in the folio was probably not made to avoid the dissyllabic pronunciation of 'worlds,'

but on account of the irregular metre of the first half of the line, which surely needs some amendment.

p. 229, *M.H.T.*, l. 1231. The excellent emendation 'The' for 'And' (due to Mr J. C. Smith) makes sense of a passage which has hitherto been nonsense, and may be regarded as certain.

p. 285, *Visions of Petrarch*, l. 85. Why is not Morris's correction 'behold,' which the editor regards as 'obviously right,' admitted into the text?

p. 507. There are several 'faults escaped in the print' on this page: the reference '*Dec.* 7' should be '*Dec.* 76'; that for 'thinken,' two lines lower, is missing (perhaps *Feb.* 41), and the next, to '*Ap.* 14,' is in some way wrong.

p. 518. Note on *Mother Hubberds Tale*, l. 913. The explanation of 'himselfe will a daw trie,' given on the authority of Mr Walter Worrall, is certainly right, and it is not very difficult to see how 'trie' got this meaning from the original sense, 'separate,' 'mark off' (good from bad): 'he will mark himself off as a pretentious fool.'

ib. Note on l. 1204. Professor de Sélincourt knows, of course, that 'vail' is simply a modern form of 'avail,' which meant 'advantage,' hence 'gift,' 'bribe'; so that it is surely superfluous to mention the conjecture 'a vaile' here.

ib. Note on *Ruines of Rome*, l. 119. The editor seems to agree with Morris that some such rhyme as 'failed' is required here. As a matter of fact the rhyme should be with '-ed' (of 'traueiled'), and the last syllable of 'palaces' supplies an assonance with which Spenser was apparently satisfied.

p. 521. Note on *Amoretti*, xxvi. 4. Mr Greg's suggestion is right enough as regards the meaning, but there is no misprint: 'firbloome' is quite an admissible form. See *N.E.D.* under 'fur' and 'furze.'

The volume is a fine specimen of typography, beautiful to look at and delightful to read. It has facsimile reproductions of the title-pages of the original editions, and contains not only the woodcuts of the *Shepheardes Calender*, which have been made tolerably familiar by Dr Sommer's reprint of the first quarto, but also the very interesting pictures attached to the translations from Petrarch and du Bellay in Van der Noodt's *Theatre for Worldlings* (1569). We must congratulate both Professor de Sélincourt and the Clarendon Press on the result of their joint labours.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

The Poems of John Dryden. Edited with an Introduction and Textual Notes by John Sargeaunt (Oxford edition). London: Frowde. 1910. 8vo. xxiii + 606 pp.

Mr Sargeaunt is the first editor of Dryden who has given a reprint of his poems (omitting the dramas and the translation of Virgil) in the spelling and capitals of the original editions, and he has restored the

correct text in numberless instances. By so doing he has deserved well of students of English literature. One may question, to be sure, whether the retaining of the original spelling in a cheap edition, designed for circulation among the unlearned, is likely to increase the number of admirers of Dryden; in such a volume literal fidelity to the orthography of seventeenth-century compositors is a question of policy, not of scholarship. Furthermore, if an editor wishes to give as an introduction to a popular edition fifteen pages of criticism of his predecessors, rather than some account of the life and genius of Dryden, or, if that would be out of place in a text edition, some description of the original editions of the different poems; and if he prefers to devote the small space available for notes to pointing out sedulously all the places in which his predecessors have strayed from the path of textual accuracy, rather than to explaining briefly passages that without comment are wholly unintelligible to modern readers,—if an editor prefers such a course, one may marvel at his taste, but one cannot therefore denounce him as incompetent. But when Mr Sargeaunt passes from criticism to vituperation (see in particular p. xxii of his Introduction), one is impelled to look rather searchingly at his book, to see whether he himself may not be liable to some of the reproaches that he showers so plentifully on his fellow-students of Dryden.

An editor of Dryden should know first of all what editions of each poem were published during the author's lifetime; he should determine which text is to be regarded as Dryden's final revision, and should adopt that text as the basis of his own reprint. In his notes he should give accurate bibliographical information as to each of the other texts. If he gives variant readings from texts other than those adopted as the basis of his own edition, he should do his work thoroughly, citing all variants except insignificant variations in spelling, capitals, and punctuation.

Mr Sargeaunt's treatment of the very first piece in his volume, *A Poem upon the Death of his late Highness, Oliver, Lord Protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, is an indication of his shortcomings in the first requirement of a text editor. Two editions of this poem were published in 1659, one by itself, the other with poems by Waller and Sprat, in a volume entitled *Three Poems upon the Death of his late Highnesse Oliver*, etc. Mr Sargeaunt apparently has not seen the *Three Poems* text, to which he makes no reference, though it is mentioned both by Christie and by Professor Saintsbury, of whose editorial work he speaks so contemptuously in his Introduction. In stanza 14, line 4, he corrects 'are sown' of the '1659' text into 'is sown.' The correction is just; it is found in the *Three Poems* text of 1659.

On *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel*, despite its mixed authorship, an editor of Dryden might be expected to bestow reasonable care. The first and second editions of this poem were published in 1682, the third in 1716, in the *Second Part of Miscellany Poems*. 'Will it be believed that the English editor,' to quote Mr Sargeaunt's own indignant rhetoric in his Introduction (p. xiii), overlooks the real

second edition, which he should have taken as the basis of his text, and calls the third edition the second, in the face of a plain statement in the edition itself? He does so, and on line 33 he remarks 'since] *The editors give* as,' which is the reading of the second and third editions.

Dryden's epistle *To the Earl of Roscomon* was printed with that nobleman's *Essay on Translated Verse*, which was first published in 1684, but which appeared in a second edition in 1685. Between the two editions Dryden, besides correcting a misprint in his poem (line 47), made two changes in it (lines 60 and 72). Of course the second edition is that which should be followed, but of its existence Mr Sargeaunt is apparently ignorant. Thus in line 60 he reads 'a *Brittish*' (as in ed. 1) and remarks, '*Some editions wrongly give* an English,' which is Dryden's own corrected version. But in line 72 he gives 'Who both' (as in ed. 2) instead of 'He both' (as in ed. 1). This last, from Mr Sargeaunt's point of view, is an error of detail; Mr Sargeaunt presumably used as the basis of his collation a text that had the reading of the second edition and simply neglected to make the correction from the first edition: he gives no note on the line.

The poet's epistle *To my Honour'd Friend Dr Charleton* was similarly published with Charleton's *Chorea Gigantum*, 1663. Of that book there were two issues, which may be distinguished by the presence or absence of the censor's imprimatur, dated '11 Sept. 1662.' Dryden's poem as printed in the two issues shows variations of text in lines 13, 22, 50, 52, and 55. Mr Sargeaunt gives the text of the copy without the imprimatur, and is apparently ignorant of the existence of the other; Scott's note on line 50 should have made him suspect the true state of the case. The poem was reprinted by Tonson in 1704 (in *Poetical Miscellanies, the Fifth Part*), with variant readings in lines 7, 22, and 54, the first of which Mr Sargeaunt omits.

Mr Sargeaunt's disregard of the fairly well-known fact that varying issues exist of the same edition of several poems by Dryden is the more surprising since he refers to the matter in his Introduction. 'These restorations of the text,' he writes (p. xv), referring to some of his own work, 'are such as Dryden's editors might with reasonable industry have succeeded in making. There is, however, one problem of which they never suspected the existence. My friend, Mr Henry B. Wheatley, discovered that what profess to be copies of the first edition of *Absalom and Achitophel* differ from one another.' Mr Wheatley's discovery was long ago anticipated; see a note in the Aldine Dryden (London, Bell, 1891), which states that in line 179 of *Absalom and Achitophel* at least one copy of the first edition reads 'patriot's' instead of 'patron's.' This note presumably goes back to the original Aldine edition of 1832–33, to which I am at present unable to refer; at all events it is found in the American reprint of that edition (Boston, 1864). In my own Cambridge edition (Boston, 1908), I ought to have reproduced this note, and I ought to have searched further than the copy of the first edition owned by the Harvard Library, which I used for my own collation. Mr Sargeaunt, though he apparently had the varying issues

directly under his hand, followed a similarly slothful course. Just below he loftily remarks: 'It is obviously impossible to collate all existing copies.' The case is not so bad as that; in only two instances (*The Medal* and possibly *Annus Mirabilis*) have I found reason to believe that there were more than two differing issues of the same edition.

Mr Wheatley's 'discovery' led Mr Sargeaunt to remark that there were two different issues of the first edition (1667) of *Annus Mirabilis*. He had them both at hand, and cites a most interesting variant reading in stanza 105. I had suspected the existence of the two issues from the fact that a reading quoted by Christie for stanza 67, line 3, was not found in the Harvard Library copy. I made inquiries of the British Museum, the Yale Library, and one private collector, but was not fortunate enough to find a copy of the other issue. Mr Sargeaunt fails to record any variation of text between his two 1667 issues for stanza 67, line 3; perhaps there were really three issues of the first edition, and the two used by him agree on this line.

Mr Sargeaunt derives his text of *The Medal* 'from the second edition, 1683.' This statement seems not quite accurate; the second edition was published in *Miscellany Poems*, 1684, though it has a separate title-page, dated 1683. In the *Epistle to the Whigs* the second edition has a clear misprint, 'same cases' instead of 'some cases,' which Mr Sargeaunt duly reproduces (page 83, line 14); all issues of the first edition (1682), and the third edition (1692) read 'some cases.' Below (page 83, line 48) the second and third editions read 'are printed' (instead of 'is printed'), but this time Mr Sargeaunt, presumably by an error of collation, gives the text of the first edition. In my Cambridge Dryden I note that there are two issues of the first edition, distinguished by the presence or absence of the Latin motto at the close of the poem, and I cite some important variations between them in lines 174 and 179–182. Since my collation was completed the University of California Library has received a copy of the first edition that contains the motto but agrees in these lines with the text of the Harvard copy without the motto. I conclude that there are three issues of this first edition.

Mr Sargeaunt's indications of the sources of his own texts are not always satisfactory. Thus on *A Letter to Sir George Etherege* he has the note, 'Text from the *Miscellanies* of several dates'! The piece was first printed, so far as I have been able to discover, in the third edition of *Sylvae* (1702). His text of the prologue to *The Prophetess* would seem, according to his note, to be derived from a copy of the play printed in 1690. I have been unable to find that this prologue was printed before the year 1708, in the second edition of *The Annual Miscellany for the Year 1694*. The prologue, as spoken, gave offence by its political references, and was consequently suppressed; perhaps some copies of *The Prophetess* were printed containing it and Mr Sargeaunt has been fortunate enough to see one of them. Conversely, he states that the prologue and epilogue to *Cleomenes* were not printed with

the first edition of the play. They are found in the copy owned by the Harvard Library. On the prologue to *The Unhappy Favourite* Mr Sargeaunt writes the note: 'Printed in the *Miscellanies* of 1684 and with the play, which is by Banks, in 1685.' This piece appeared in the first edition of the play, dated 1682, but printed, as Mr Sargeaunt might have learned from Professor Arber's reprint of the *Term Catalogues*, near the close of 1681. On *A Song for St Cecilia's Day, November* 22, 1687, Mr Sargeaunt gives a note that is important, if true: 'Text from the original of 1687.' This ode, like its greater successor, *Alexander's Feast*, was probably originally printed as a broadside at the time that it was sung in public, but I have been unable to find any mention of a surviving copy of that broadside, other than the hint in Mr Sargeaunt's note. Mr Sargeaunt, if he has had better luck, might well have been more explicit in his statement. On Dryden's verses *Upon the Death of the Viscount of Dundee* Mr Sargeaunt gives the somewhat cryptic statement: 'Text of 1704.' Two texts of this epigram were printed in 1704, one in *Poetical Miscellanies, the Fifth Part*, and the other in *Poems on Affairs of State*, vol. iii. Mr Sargeaunt apparently follows the former text, but in the title he corrects 'Earl' into 'Viscount,' and in line 7 substitutes 'living didst' (of *Poems on Affairs of State*) for 'dying did' (of the *Miscellanies*), probably by an error of collation, since he gives no note on the line. The epitaph *On the Monument of the Marquis of Winchester* Mr Sargeaunt says that he prints from 'Pope's *Miscellanies*, 1712.' But here he neglects the capitals of the original text, which he ordinarily sedulously preserves, and in the first line gives 'untainted' (the reading on the monument itself) instead of 'undaunted' (the reading in the *Miscellanies*), with no note upon the change of text.

Several of Dryden's early prologues, epilogues, and songs were printed in contemporary miscellanies, presumably without his sanction, with texts that, though they may preserve some variant readings that actually came from Dryden, can hardly be regarded as approved by him. The duty of an editor towards these miscellanies is hard to define; he may entirely disregard them, he may mention that they contain certain pieces by Dryden, without bothering to give a complete collation of the texts found in them, or he may conscientiously give in his notes all the information to be derived from them. Mr Sargeaunt shuffles between the first and third courses in a fashion that cannot be commended. There are four such miscellanies known to me, with apparently equal claims to attention or neglect: *Westminster Drollery; or, A Choice Collection of the Newest Songs and Poems*, 1671; *Westminster Drollery, the Second Part*, 1672; *New Court Songs and Poems, by R. V., Gent.*, 1672; and *Covent Garden Drollery*, 1672. (Of this last miscellany there are two issues, said to be 'collected' by 'A. B.' and by 'R. B.' respectively. I have been unable to consult the former, but have found no evidence that the text of Dryden's pieces varies in the two issues.) Of these four Mr Sargeaunt is apparently acquainted only with *Covent Garden Drollery*, though Christie long ago called attention

(Globe Dryden, p. 367) to *New Court Songs and Poems*, which contains the songs from *Marriage à la Mode*, and (*ibid.*, p. 411) to *Westminster Drollery* [*the Second Part*], which contains the *Prologue spoken on the First Day of the King's House acting after the Fire* and one song from *Marriage à la Mode*. From *Covent Garden Drollery* Mr Sargeaunt gives an incomplete list of variants for the prologue to *Albumazar*, *Prologue spoken on the First Day of the King's House acting after the Fire*, and the prologue to *Marriage à la Mode*; for the epilogue to *Marriage à la Mode* he gives no variants at all.

In his book Mr Sargeaunt frequently shows much more zeal in calling attention to the errors of previous editors (which, once corrected, become of no importance to anybody) than to noting variations of text that are due, or may be due, to Dryden himself. The most glaring instance of this is in *Mac Flecknoe*. As is well known, Dryden thoroughly revised this poem between the appearance of the first edition (1682) and that of the second (in *Miscellany Poems*, 1684); the chief variants were noted by Malone in the year 1800 (*Prose Works of John Dryden*, vol. i, pp. 170–172). Mr Sargeaunt gives only seven out of the multitude. Of those seven he regards one as of sufficient importance to write a whole paragraph about it in his Introduction (pp. xxii, xxiii). Here he gives the reading of line 185 in the first edition as:

> But so transfus'd as Oyls on Waters flow.

It is really, in the two copies of the first edition accessible to me (owned by private collectors in New York):

> But so transfus'd as Oyls on Water Flow.

Unless there were two issues of this first edition, the variation is not of much importance except as a measure of Mr Sargeaunt's scholarly accuracy. But the capital letter on 'Flow' may give some support to the opinion expressed in my edition that this word should be taken as a noun rather than a verb, 'Water' being a misprint for 'Water's' or 'Waters' (the reading of the second edition). Mr Sargeaunt's interpretation and reading of the passage, however, may be correct, even though his citation of the first edition be faulty.

In this review of a book that, despite real merits, absolutely invites attack owing to its arrogant tone, I have not exhausted the material for censure derived from my examination of it. I may have said enough, however, to add point to Mr Sargeaunt's pungent statement in his Introduction (p. xi): 'Some evil spirit seems to have dogged the steps of Dryden's editors, and may well raise apprehension in one who ventures to add himself to their number.'

It is plain that for students of English letters a full and accurate bibliography of Dryden is greatly to be desired. Such a bibliography would not be easy to prepare, since, so far as I know, no collection of the contemporary editions of the poet's writings even approaches completeness. A still greater desideratum is a critical edition of Dryden's

complete works, in the spelling of the originals, and with the variant readings duly recorded. Such an edition could hardly be commercially profitable, and could probably best be undertaken by one of the great universities of England or America. The editorial labour would have to be intrusted to more than one person, for no single man could be expected to submit to the wearisome, cheerless, and almost endless drudgery that would be involved in the preparation of a really definitive edition.

GEORGE R. NOYES.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, U.S.A.

A Short History of English Versification. By MAX KALUZA. Translated by A. C. Dunstan. London: George Allen. 1911. 8vo. xv + 396 pp.

English prosody is a study which theorists have done so much to obscure that the ordinary student is apt to abandon it in despair after attempting to reconcile conflicting views and to find a foundation for baseless fabrics. As generally happens where the amateur has not yet retired before the scientific enquirer, much of the confusion arises from a want of agreement as to the meaning of the terms used, much also from the want of a thoroughgoing analysis. While English and American prosodists have been evolving theories of modern English versification, German investigators have begun at the beginning and sought to establish the principles underlying Old English and Middle English versification. It is true that entire unanimity has not yet been reached as to these principles, but at any rate the essential facts are secure.

In treating of modern English prosody the native might be expected to possess a great advantage over the foreigner, but this has not always been the case, judging by results. The English metrist is too apt to base his theories upon his own reading of English verse; his treatment tends to be subjective and therefore unscientific. Strictly speaking, we should have to know how the poet reads his own verses, but this knowledge has hitherto been unattainable, as no one has thought of making an exact, i.e. phonetic, transcription of the poet's delivery, nor has the poet thought of providing phonographic records for the prosodists. Until this be done, we can hardly expect to be able to understand fully the poet's versification. This of course has nothing to do with individual preferences by readers, of which our poet knows and cares nothing. The musical composer and the executants who 'interpret' his works are not always of one mind. In Professor Kaluza's manual we find a detailed presentment and discussion of the facts and theories of Old English and Middle English versification, followed by a slighter and chiefly descriptive treatment of modern English verse-forms. In the preface to the German edition (1909), Professor Kaluza says he has no thought of rivalry with Schipper's well-known larger treatise or with

his *Grundriss*. He hopes there is room for another book suitable for less advanced students; moreover he considers Schipper's treatment of O.E. and M.E. prosody *verbesserungsbedürftig*. In Kaluza's book about two-thirds of the whole space is allotted to the O.E. and M.E. periods. His excuse for so full a treatment is that authorities are still not agreed, and after setting forth and criticising the views of various scholars such as Möller, Sievers, Trautmann, Schipper, etc. he himself suggests a compromise between the 'two-beat' and the 'four-beat' theories based on a division of the half-line into four 'members' (glieder). The result of his analysis is ninety subspecies for O.E. verse, under which every half-line must surely range itself without a murmur. Kaluza accepts Sievers' well-known analysis and types with certain modifications of his own. The question of the mode of delivery (recitation, singing) he does not discuss. The explanation of vowel-alliteration, which he accepts without question, namely the assumption of the existence of the glottal stop, is alluringly simple, but he should have mentioned that this theory does not commend itself to all scholars. Nor is any mention made of Sievers' denial of the existence of strophic structure in O.E. verse. Kaluza's objection (pp. 30, 31) to the two-beat theory of O.E. versification, based on the usage of Otfrid and Laȝamon, takes it for granted that the metrical stress of O.E. verse was preserved unaltered right up to the middle of the twelfth century. Thus on p. 31 he says 'If, therefore, Otfrid and Laȝamon could use these inflexional and derivative syllables as full beats, then they must be assumed as full beats for the much earlier alliterative verse.' Further, on p. 138, he says 'Whoever, therefore, finds four beats in Laȝamon, must also find four in O.E. verse.' In this connexion we must notice that Kaluza, like some other scholars, is of opinion that the O.E. alliterative long line 'decayed.' 'The strict laws,' he says (p. 128), 'which had regulated its structure in the O.E. period were no longer observed with the same care' (i.e. in Early M.E.). It is well here to bear in mind that the language of the early M.E. poems such as the *Brut* is the popular speech or at least the ordinary speech of the literate Englishmen of the time so far as its case endings and stress is concerned. The rules of O.E. versification were intended for, and only applicable to, the O.E. literary poetic language; when on the disappearance of Anglo-Saxon culture this language ceased to be used, the rules of its prosody would also lose their *raison d'être* and be forgotten. Just as we assume that in O.E. times there must have existed a popular speech differing considerably in vocabulary, structure and pronunciation from the literary speech, which popular speech at last attained to recognition and employment as a literary vehicle in early M.E., may we not also assume the existence in O.E. of a popular form of versification orally transmitted, differing from the literary form and surviving it? Such an assumption is in accordance with what is observable in later English literature, as well as in the literatures of other countries. It was natural therefore that the early M.E. poet should use the versification which he heard round him in unwritten song and story, and not at all natural that he should seek to

adapt an archaic form of versification quite unsuitable to his material, even if he were acquainted with it. Mention might have been made of the verses contained in the later part of the Saxon Chronicle, which show a strong resemblance to the *Brut* in their versification. In his Introduction Kaluza remarks 'By the side of the purely descriptive and the historical treatment of English prosody there must be an aesthetic-critical examination of the individual verses and stanzas. A judgment of their beauty and their fitness, both in general and with reference to the particular aims of the poet, must be arrived at.' The hopes aroused by this statement are hardly fulfilled in the part of the book devoted to Modern English prosody. Here Kaluza depends a great deal on the writings of English prosodists, whom he frequently quotes without offering any criticism of his own. A few points only may be noticed. On p. 271 he says 'The attempts to write English quantitative verse, especially the quantitative hexameter, met with no success, because the differences in quantity in N.E. (Mod. English) are not so marked as in Latin and Greek, and the word-accent and sentence-accent in N.E. cannot give way to the verse-accent as in Latin and Greek.' The want of success would seem to be due rather to the failure of poets to discriminate accurately the quantity of syllables in English, than to the actual absence of marked difference in quantity. Greek and Latin poets were trained at school to distinguish quantity; even we moderns have our *Gradus ad Parnassum* as a guide in cases of doubt, when we are writing Latin verses. The English versifier has no such training, and in the absence of an authoritative guide he has to trust to his ear, which often leads him astray. Is it any wonder then if he has 'met with no success'? Some English poets, however, have succeeded in writing perfect or nearly perfect hexameters on the classical model, and any trained phonetician could produce technically correct lines. As regards Kaluza's statement that 'the word-accent and the sentence-accent in N.E. cannot give way to the verse-accent,' this is disproved by countless instances. Take for example Byron's line 'And he saw the lean dogs beneath the wall,' quoted by Kaluza on p. 300. A strong sentence-stress falls on 'lean,' but the verse-scheme requires it to be weakly stressed. Many persons, perhaps some poets also, 'scan' the lines as they read, i.e. emphasize the metrical stress at the expense of the normal stress. Being so familiar in English verse with the scheme $\times\,'\,\times\,'\,\times\,'$ etc. they fit the words into it, half unconsciously perhaps; consequently all sorts of abnormal stresses occur and excite no remark. In the case of English hexameters, the reader who knows no Greek or Latin finds no rhythm at all as he reads them with normal pronunciation, while the English classical scholar, familiar with the metre which he reads in his own and often incorrect way (heavily stressing every long syllable at the beginning of a foot) applies his method of reading to English imitations and finds that all sorts of unnatural stresses occur. Again no success. The subject of quantity (p. 277) is dismissed in a few lines. 'Quantity,' we are told, 'is also of some importance for English prosody.' Now nothing is more striking

about the versification of such a careful artist as Tennyson than the important part played by the quantity of syllables in obtaining subtle sound-effects. A fuller treatment might have been expected from Professor Kaluza of this interesting part of the subject.

While it may be thought that an undue amount of attention has been devoted to the earlier versification, and not enough to the modern period, the fact remains that Professor Kaluza's book contains much of value, and in its English dress will, we hope, lead younger students to undertake investigations on sound principles in English metrics.

The translation is on the whole adequate. On p. 48 l. 2 'settled' (beseitigt) should be 'disposed of'; on p. 272 l. 2 'interchange' should be 'alternation' (abwechslung). The first sentence of § 222 is so condensed as to be misleading. Such terms as 'hovering accent' and 'gliding ending' do not altogether recommend themselves.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period. By M. G. Clarke. (Girton College Studies No. III.) Cambridge: University Press. 1911. 8vo. xiv + 263 pp.

Under this somewhat cumbersome title Miss M. G. Clarke presents us with an interesting and valuable study of the historical elements which may be discovered in the Old English heroic poems. During the greater part of the nineteenth century English and continental scholarship occupied itself almost entirely with the textual study of these poems or with their interpretation in terms of myth and allegory, and it is only during the last twenty-five or thirty years that the very important question of their historical truth has been a matter of investigation. Already much valuable work has been done by Mr Chadwick in his work on the *Origin of the English Nation* and by Dr Axel Olrik in his studies of Danish heroic poetry, to mention two only of the pioneers, and Miss Clarke now summarises the results attained, makes independent and judicious criticisms of her own, and adds a good deal of material which she has discovered or worked out for herself.

The work includes a full discussion of the references to the Danes, the Swedes and the Götar, and an account of the Offa, Finn, Hilde, Weland, Walthari and Ermanric sagas, so far as allusion is made to them in Old English poetry. In each chapter we have a summary view of the O.E. references, then a conspectus of the evidence from other sources, followed by a comparative view of the two, concluding with a summary of inferences as to the historical truth which may with justice be deduced from the allusions in the poems. The evidence is often so scanty that it is difficult to come to decisions of assured finality, but the author is in no hurry to draw definite conclusions and is rarely a prey to pure theorising. In the discussion of the Ingeld-Froda episode in *Beowulf* and of the figures of Dan and Fróði in the line of Danish

kings, it is to be regretted that Miss Clarke does not seem to have been able to consult the second volume of Dr Olrik's *Danmarks Heltedigtning*, with its full discussion of the Starkad story and of the later Skjǫldung kings.

The book is an invaluable storehouse of reference and quotation which must make it a handbook for every student who wishes to make a thorough study of O.E. heroic poetry, and considering the mass of reference and quotation it is as a whole remarkably free from error. We may, however, point out two slips, one somewhat serious, in the references. On p. 111 the reference for the long rule of Hrothgar and Hrothwulf should be to *Widsith*, ll. 45 ff., and not to *Beowulf*, ll. 1163 ff., while the quotation from *Waldere* on p. 190 has no reference at all to the Hilde saga. The translations are at times slipshod and inaccurate. 'Ðæs ofereode, þisses swa mæg' is not satisfactorily rendered by 'That came to an end, this may likewise' (p. 7) or 'wæs sio hond to strong se þe meca gehwane mine gefræge swenge ofersohte' by 'too strong was the hand which, as I have heard, surpassed every sword in its stroke,' and the translations from the Latin chroniclers on pp. 43 and 44 are equally at fault. These inaccuracies make it the more to be regretted that in many cases the original is not quoted. This is almost uniformly the case in the passages quoted from Old Norse, which are given only in translation. In a book which must always be read by scholars rather than by the general reader it would have been well to quote the original in every case where a full translation is given. Space might well have been found for this by sacrificing the somewhat superfluous sketch of Old Norse Literature on pp. 13–24. There are numerous small slips in spelling and expression, and one cannot but condemn the publication of a book of this character without an index. Amid the mass of detail it is almost impossible rapidly to find the exact reference to a particular person or poem which one may require; and this detracts very seriously from the usefulness of the book. Criticisms of detail must not however blind us to its great value and interest as a whole, and the writer only makes them in the hope that a second edition may be called for ere long and the author be able to remove these blots.

Allen Mawer.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

The Spirit of Romance. An Attempt to define somewhat the Charm of the pre-Renaissance Literature of Latin Europe. By Ezra Pound. London: J. M. Dent. n.d. 8vo. x + 251 pp.

Mr Ezra Pound is right in his admiration of poetry, and in the claim which he makes on behalf of the troubadours and others that they should be valued as living authors. Some of his attention is given to Dante, and in his later studies he comes down beyond the Middle Ages, to Camoens and Lope de Vega, poets not without honour; but the chief part of his work is concerned with poets less generally known,

with Arnaut Daniel and Guido Guinicelli and others in Provence and Italy. His argument is that those earlier composers are not to be treated as mere curiosities or literary antiquities. He is not the first to whom they have seemed beautiful, but their old poetry is not so well known as to make his generous advocacy superfluous. His book ought to be an encouragement to many young people to undertake some explorations, and make discoveries for themselves, especially among the lyric poets who were the masters of Dante. Generally speaking Mr Pound (like many other critics) is happier in his admiration than his censure. He ought not to speak disrespectfully of philology. He has escaped from it, he says, in order to follow pure poetry. There seems to be a fallacy in this, and a misconception of the nature of pure poetry. It is true that the enjoyment of poetry is a different thing from a philological demonstration, but the study of poetry, if it is to be anything but monotonous praise, is bound to be technical and analytic. The student of pure music or architecture does not boast of escaping from the scientific foundations of his art. One might appeal to Dante, whose analysis of his own poems is as strict as Euclid, and whose treatise *De Vulgari Eloquentia* is (for the most part) pure and dry philology. There is also the example of Jacob Grimm. The Preface to the *Deutsche Grammatik* shows more toleration and more comprehension than Mr Pound. Grimm's immediate motive for his linguistic work was his interest in the poetry of Walther and Wolfram, and he is not ashamed as many philologists would be to speak of poetry in his preface; nor, on the other hand, is he troubled as Mr Pound appears to be, by any fear lest philology should hinder his appreciation of the poets.

Mr Pound has not paid quite enough attention to small things; some dead flies have escaped his notice. There is a grating misquotation of the most beautiful of all Provençal lyrics, the poem of Bernart de Ventadour which begins with the song of the lark, in a passage which Dante could not outdo. Some of the minor conventions are neglected; why should 'Dr W. P. Ker' be treated with outward respect (even though his conclusions are rejected) when 'Paget Toynbee' is spoken of without ceremony (though on the whole with approbation)? Miss Farnell's translation of the *Lives* of the Troubadours has never yet had all the gratitude it deserves; Mr Pound speaks of her, abruptly, as 'Farnell'; otherwise he does no injustice to her admirable book. The great fault of Mr Pound's work is that it shows too little consideration for the readers who know nothing, but who are prepared to learn. The readers who know as much as Mr Pound about these poets are few in number; those who know less will have great difficulty in making out the meaning of his arguments. No doubt, it is one of the hardest problems in historical writing: how to make an intelligible story about a literature wholly unfamiliar and foreign. The thing can be done; Mr Nicholson's *Literary History of the Arabs* is a fascinating book for many readers who know nothing of Arabic and who were previously little interested in the subject. It is not everyone who can perform a feat of skill like this; Mr Pound has certainly not come near to equal it.

Those who wish for a clear statement of the aims and the several kinds of Provençal poetry will find nothing here to compare with the three papers by M. Jeanroy, published a few years ago in the *Revue des deux mondes.*

If many of Mr Pound's opinions seem debatable, that is no more than may be said of the greatest critics. Is not his estimate of Camoens rather too low, and unjust to the lyrical poetry? Coming back to the earlier poets, we might ask whether the Count of Poitiers—'William Earl of Poiton'—did not deserve more attention than is given him. 'The Spirit of Romance' is in his rhymes; more particularly, his poems are interesting for their mediation between popular and 'courtly' forms; for their ribaldry, their pathos, both equally genuine and characteristic; for their mastery of the shorter forms of verse, unlike the statelier and slower measures which have the heroic line as their base. Prosody ought to have been used more freely in explaining the character of the early lyric poets; it is repulsive to many students, but those who are engaged in the history of poetry cannot afford to do without it. The patterns of verse can be described in such a way as to explain many poetical things outside of prosody. In the earlier lyric poetry of the Romance languages—French, Provençal and Italian—(not to speak of the lyrics of the Minnesingers) there are frequent anticipations of later forms; not only of stanzas (such as the *rhyme royal*) but of phrasing and poetical syntax. There are many Provençal poets who are Elizabethan in their poetical language—in verse, in ideas, and in the way their ideas are disposed. It might be interesting to consider in what respects the following passage differs from the manner of the Elizabethan sonneteers—say Drayton or Daniel:

> Amors et ieu em de tal guiza pres
> Qu'ora ni jorn, nueg ni mati ni ser
> No s part de me, ni eu de bon esper
> E mort m'agra la dolors, tan grans es,
> S'en bon esper no m fos asseguratz.

A survey which goes from the earliest Provençal to Camoens and Lope de Vega, and which is not checked by the most difficult and subtle passages, might have brought out more clearly the relation of the different schools or orders to one another; of Petrarch to the Provençal authors, of Camoens to Petrarch. The title of the book implies that there is a real community of poets, that they have ideas in common, that thoughts and melodies are translated from one age and one language to another. The history of 'courtly makers' from William of Poitiers to Cowley might be a tedious thing, and much of it would be a record of vanities; but it is not impossible. It requires a fine understanding of poetry such as is displayed throughout this book; it requires also a less enthusiastic style, a more deliberate and more prosaic method; the example of Dante is not to be despised; he did not think it expedient to be poetical in style when he was writing as an analyst of poetry.

W. P. Ker.

London.

A Century of French Poets. Edited by FRANCIS YVON ECCLES. London: Constable. 1909. 8vo. ix + 399 pp.

This Chrestomathy is disappointing. Mr Eccles states his purpose thus: 'My plan was to cull among the works of some forty poets—not necessarily all the best, but each representing a phase in the later poetical development of France—such examples as should convey a just notion of their peculiar qualities and of their range. For this reason I have found no place for some better poets than Millevoye, Delavigne, Laprade and even Sully-Prudhomme; and I have passed by many reputed masterpieces; not of course as soaring above the ordinary level of their authors, but because they did not appear to illustrate an authentic manner or to furnish a contributory type.' The idea was an excellent one. Such an Anthology, not of purple passages, but of illustrative poems, has long been a desideratum, for Walch's overfilled volumes cannot be said to have supplied it. But the task was a difficult one, and, while I am unwilling to appear over-critical, I do not think it can be said that Mr Eccles has succeeded in carrying out his own plan. Why are Stuart Merrill and Frances Jammes omitted? Both certainly represent phases in the later poetical development of France, phases which are represented by no poet in Mr Eccles' selection. Why are Rimbaud and Tristan Corbière unsampled? Why is Millevoye inserted and Chênedollé, a far more important forerunner of Romanticism, left out? And this is not all. Poets included in the Chrestomathy are, in many cases, not represented by really typical and illustrative examples. Take Leconte de Lisle, for example. Where are illustrations of his evocations of the barbaric past of Europe and Asia, of his 'ferocious hostility to the faith of his fathers, which...disfigures his presentment of the middle ages'? (Is Mr Belloc's advice responsible for this omission of a very characteristic aspect of Leconte de Lisle's work?) Or of the nostalgia that inspired many a fine poem breathing the love of his native island and calling up the vision of his first love? Where, indeed, are examples of any of those love poems that prove so conclusively that he was not *impassible*? The selection from Leconte de Lisle, save for the inclusion of *Le Sacre de Paris*, is less than conventional, it is quite unsatisfactory. Take Laforgue again. There are no examples of his alexandrines or of his *vers libres*. This is an unfortunate omission in the case of a poet whose versification stands at so important a dividing of the ways. Space ought certainly to have been found for, say, *L'Hiver qui vient* and *Complainte des Condoléances au Soleil*, or some other equally illustrative poems. Vielé-Griffin is another example. Who would guess from the short lyrics adduced by Mr Eccles that this was the magnificent poet of *La Chevauchée d'Yeldis* and *Au Tombeau d'Hélène*, of that glorious series *L'Amour sacré*?

It would be ungracious not to acknowledge the value of much of Mr Eccles' work. The first half of the book is, on the whole, excellent, including the introduction, but Tristan l'Hermite deserved a passing word. There can be nothing but praise for the selection from Baudelaire, the only satisfactory excerpt from his work ever included in an

anthology. And there are others. The notices, too, are, almost without exception, excellent, and present in a handy form what I, for one, have often had to seek in a dozen different places. But I do not understand, to take only one point of difference, why Mr Eccles wonders whether Moréas 'will succeed in delivering a personality which is possibly vigorous from the nemesis of his triumphant assimilations'? Surely *Les Stances* are a sufficient reply. The bibliographical indications, also, in many cases, need thorough revision. The list of further references on the difficult matter of the theory of French verse given on p. 380, is quite inadequate. Becq de Fouquières, Ténint, Clair Tisseur, Sully-Prudhomme, Remy de Gourmont, are excellent authorities, each in his own way, but Saran and Wulff, at least, ought to have been mentioned, not to speak of many a French disciple or critic of Becq de Fouquières—M. de la Grasserie and Prof. Maurice Grammont, at any rate. The title of one of the manuals cited as of practical, not theoretic value, is given wrong; it is by Brandin and Hartog, not by Prof. Brandin alone. And Banville is quite valueless, except from the historical point of view.

The notes are on the whole well conceived. By why include translations? And why grammatical or etymological matter? Such notes as '*boule*, "sphere,"' '*morgue tranchante*, "peremptory pride"; the origin of *morgue* is unknown,' are unnecessary. '*Pâtir* was taken directly from Latin *pati* by learned men etc.' is wrong. These examples come from p. 338 and are comments on the first two passages in the book. Further examples of unnecessary notes are p. 338: '*l'exercice*, "drill."' p. 341: 'the luminous density of this line gives it a classical nobility'; 'this might really be Racine'; 'a flat, colourless, pretentious line.' p. 356: '*filon*, "vein."' p. 358: '*glapissent*, "yelp."' p. 370: '*brut*, "unhewn."' p. 372: 'a fine image'; 'this is positivism'; 'this is Walt Whitman.' p. 374: '*sans se le dire*, "unconsciously."' p. 374: 'we scrape the bottom of the trough and drink sour wine' (as a rendering of a quite easy line in passage CXXII). The notes on passage LXI, and some of those on passages CXI, CXVI, are wrong. Those on passage CXVI show, in conjunction with others, that Mr Eccles does not understand *vers libres*. The note on Furnes (p. 373) might have included a reference to Camille Lemonnier's *Petit Homme de Dieu*. On p. 374 the note on *aime-laine* is incorrect (cf. Brunot, *Histoire de la Langue française*, I, pp. 283–4). The etymology of *prud'homme* is also incorrect. The 'perhaps' in the note on *buccins* might be omitted.

It seems ungracious to pick Mr Eccles' work to pieces in this way, but the scheme of the book is so good that its execution ought to be brought up to the level of the scheme. I trust that in a new edition—which ought certainly to be called for, for, in spite of all, Mr Eccles' book is the best anthology of nineteenth-century French poetry published in England—the author will see his way to make the selection really representative, to rewrite many of his notes and bring his appendix up to the mark required by modern scholarship.

THOMAS B. RUDMOSE-BROWN.

DUBLIN.

Ugo Foscolo in Inghilterra. Saggi. Da Francesco Viglione. Catania: Vincenzo Muglia. 1910. 8vo. vi + 330 pp.

Signor Viglione having had the opportunity and the patience to catalogue the Foscolo papers in the Labronica library has drawn from them a considerable amount of interesting information, which he brings to light in this volume.

A number of minor points in Foscolo's biography are elucidated and a number of mistakes in the edition of Foscolo's works are pointed out. If these were the only results achieved by Signor Viglione he would be well entitled to the thanks of all admirers of Foscolo. The ponderous volumes in the Labronica have so long deterred the student from making an exhaustive examination of them, that we welcome with real pleasure a work giving us the most important results of painstaking labours. At least we know now what to expect from the Labronica MSS. The English reader will find in this volume not a few unpublished documents and references relating to some of the many friends Foscolo made during his exile, among others to Hobhouse, Frere, J. H. Merivale, W. S. Rose, Campbell, H. Hallam, Lord John Russell, Lord and Lady Holland, Lord Glenbervie, Lady Dacre and Hudson Gurney. The little scandal which raged around Lady Sidney Morgan and her Italian friends is recalled here and elucidated, I believe, for the first time (pp. 80—90). During the first year of his residence in England Foscolo had intended to write a comprehensive work in the form of letters, comparing English and Italian customs. Its general title was to have been *Il Gazzettino del Bel Mondo*; but difficulties about the translation into English and Murray's doubts about its probable sale caused the design to be abandoned. Some extracts from the MSS. were printed in the *Opere*, but the plan of the work, and many particulars have, as Viglione shows, been hopelessly muddled by the well meaning editor. Viglione avers that the 'poetessa coronata in Campidoglio' whom Foscolo attacks was Madame de Staël. He shared Frere's opinion 'c'est toujours de l'emphase' (pp. 167—168), an opinion worthy of consideration when one bears in mind the great admiration Leopardi entertained for this lady. Foscolo however published a chapter of the *Gazzettino*, translated by Francis Cohen, or Palgrave as he wished to be called, in the *Quarterly Review* of April 1819, mainly dealing with chevaleresque poetry and with its English imitations. We find here also a passage of a letter by Frere on his imitation of the *ottava rima* in his *Whistelcraft*. In fact the attempt itself originated in reading Ginguené's account of Pulci in which some extracts are inserted as characteristic of his style. 'I was so struck with them that though it was late at night when I came home and accidentally took up the book I could not go to bed till I had translated them, and for a week after could neither think or dream of anything but Pulci; it appeared that his ingenious and humorous assumption of the vulgar character and vernacular phrase and rude popular attempts at poetry among his countrymen were capable of being transferred *mutatis mutandis* to the English nation and the present times.' (pp. 169—170.)

In connection with the same *Quarterly* article we get excerpts from letters from Mr G. N. Fazakerley (?) giving his guarded opinion about Frere and Rose; and from Hobhouse criticising severely Rose's work and abilities, though advising Foscolo to deal leniently with him. Further on we find letters from Lord Glenbervie, seeking Foscolo's advice for the introduction to his *Ricciardetto*, and from Wyffen concerning his *Gerusalemme*. Merivale appears also (p. 192) as the reviser of some attempts by Foscolo at English verse; and of course the whole controversy between Foscolo and Hobhouse is fully discussed. Yet if such references would specially interest the English reader, Viglione, we must not forget, has another purpose in view: Foscolo's biography. In the preface he apologizes for giving so many documents; but we think the apology superfluous, as the value of the book lies in the documents, and we are specially in his debt for the care and order with which he has arranged the very abundant material. Viglione is a young man; one feels the effect of this enviable defect in many a passage. In fact now and again, mainly when he introduces a new subject, draws conclusions or generalizes, the jog-trot of his prose is whipped into unnecessary high-stepping. One cannot refrain from thinking that if Viglione had left aside most of the reminiscences of his classical and philosophical readings he would spare his readers some useless and dissonant passages (e.g. pp. 29, 39, 70, 104, 119, 155). In such passages and in those where he strives to justify at all costs Foscolo's business methods, Viglione falls short of our expectations. Surely no one thinks nowadays of judging Foscolo by the standard of a heartless accountant. True enough he was arrested in November 1824 for a trifling debt, when he had weathered a much heavier storm. But all justifications are purposeless; let any one judge as he may. A prig will always frown upon Foscolo's behaviour, out of mere constitutional dislike; but anyone with some experience and with some knowledge of the peculiar unfitness for business in many a genius will be interested and sympathetic, and utterly unconcerned by the grumblings of Mrs Grundy, no matter whether British or foreign.

There is however a big blemish in this work. I can quite appreciate the difficulties of printing in Sicily English extracts, especially when the originals are faulty or difficult to read, but now that Italian scholarship is on a level with that of other nations, it is inexcusable that an Italian scholar should turn out a book dotted all through with uncouth blunders. The author tells us that he, quite properly, edited the passages which appeared to him to be faulty, but if his knowledge of English was inadequate he could easily have found the necessary help[1].

[1] Lest my words should appear too severe I give a few instances of the faults I am hinting at, leaving aside those that are clearly to be ascribed to the compositor: p. 76 *theall* = the hall; p. 77 *pater* = pattern; p. 103 *fortitude* = destitution (?); p. 137 *to* you choose = if you choose; p. 137 *unless* = useless; p. 140 I *fail* = I fell. If these mispellings are in the originals it should have been pointed out, at least. The list could be easily swelled, but there are mistakes of a different kind: thus *oil-cloth* is not *panno* (p. 75), but *tela cerata* or *linoleum*; p. 103 *Miss* Compton ought no doubt to be *Mrs*; p. 117 *fierezza catulliana* is rather surprising, since the melodious poet never endeavoured,

Apart from this the book contains a most valuable amount of first hand information carefully arranged, and since another volume is to appear shortly we may be allowed to hope that it will be sobered in the general remarks and, above all, that it will be more carefully revised.

C. Foligno.

Oxford.

Danish Conversation-Grammar. By E. J. Thomas. Heidelberg: Julius Groos. 1911. 8vo. viii + 372 pp.

This book is an English adaptation of Wied's *Dänische Konversations-Grammatik*, written according to the well known Gaspey-Otto-Sauer method. A quarter of the Grammar is taken up with a full and careful account of the pronunciation of Danish. No modern language has suffered more at the hands of English teachers in the past, and one must extend a cordial welcome to a grammar which places at the disposal of the English student the careful phonetic analysis of the sounds of Danish which we owe to Dr Jespersen and others. The system of the 'Association internationale phonétique' is used in the transcription of words and extracts, and in spite of the laborious nature of the task which the editor has set himself his work is extremely accurate. Phonetic methods are specially necessary in the teaching of Danish, which is one of the most difficult of modern European languages to speak, and they are used here to excellent purpose. One must, I think, quarrel with Mr Thomas's advice to the student to neglect the glottal stop until he has an opportunity of hearing Danish spoken. The glottal catch is as essential to the genius of Danish speech as the *liaison* to that of French and one can no more afford to neglect the one than the other. Mr Thomas' reason for his advice is the difficulty of acquiring it; but it is so prevalent in some of the dialects of England and Scotland (at least in certain positions) that there is no real difficulty in studying it at first hand; for example, the dropping of t or rather its reduction to the glottal stop in the vulgar pronunciation of 'let us' is as common in English as it is in the colloquial Danish 'lad os.'

The rest of the Grammar is on more ordinary and commonplace lines—divided strictly according to the parts of speech and following the old grammatical lines. It suffers from being neither strictly conversational (as it professes to be) nor strictly literary (as it often tends to be). Full as the book is of information on both aspects of the language, it is probable that if one relied on it very far in the endeavour to learn to speak Danish, one's language would often be old-fashioned, stilted or formal. In this respect it compares unfavourably with Miss Forchammer's little book *How to learn Danish*, which has now

to my knowledge, to usurp Marcus Porcius Cato's austere claims; and lastly at p. 124 and p. 130 we meet with a rather extraordinary anglicism: 'l'autore doveva ogni anno *liberare* non meno di tre e non più di sei volumi.' Surely it ought to have been written: '*consegnare*'!

appeared in editions adapted for the chief European nations. These shortcomings are of course due not to the editor but to the system under which he writes, and when all is said, we must extend a hearty welcome to a book containing the fullest account of the Danish language which has yet appeared in English.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

MINOR NOTICES.

Mr Herbert E. Cory in his Dissertation *The Critics of Edmund Spenser* (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 1911) aims at shewing that the high appreciation of Spenser as a poet has been continuous in English literature, each age however appreciating him in its own way, and protests against the idea that the perception of his merits in the eighteenth century was a sign of the coming of romanticism. He maintains, moreover, with more or less success, that the criticism of the eighteenth century seized some points with regard to Spenser's poetical work which were unduly neglected in the nineteenth. His collection of critical references to Spenser is a useful one, but his distinction of periods is not very happy (the 'Age of Reason' and the 'Age of Literary Anarchy' for the former and the latter halves of the seventeenth century), and his style needs some castigation. The following are examples from the first few pages of the essay: 'Volcanic floods of rhetoric on the subject now harden and glisten in countless volumes.' 'We can only say vaguely that Ben Jonson of the rocky face and mountain belly stood like a rock of reason in the very midst of the turbulent ocean of enthusiasm, scarred, sullen, but immovable, a prophet of the age at hand.' 'So it was at the close of the seventeenth century. "Hallelujah!" shouted the Elizabethans. "But hold," murmured the rationalists. After that the deluge.' It may be added that there are rather too many misprints.

G. C. M.

On the occasion of the centenary of Koltsóv's birth celebrated in 1909, a number of studies appeared in Russia, both in magazines and in book-form, devoted to the poet's life and work. Dr P. Schalfejew's *Die volkstümliche Dichtung A. Kol'covs und die russische Volkslyrik* (Berlin: Duncker, 1910), appearing a year later, seems intended for German students of Russian literature who have not access to or are unable to avail themselves of Russian sources of information. A concise Introduction treats of the stylistic devices of the folk-poetry, of which devices lists are given, further, a brief account of Koltsóv's lyrical predecessors, and

then the author takes up his main task, which is to determine how far Koltsóv has succeeded in reproducing in his lyrics the spirit and methods of the naive and charming poetry of the Russian peasants. The greater part of the book is taken up by a detailed examination of the poems with numerous quotations, of which a literal German version is given, but there is no attempt at a critical estimate of Koltsóv's debt to the poetry which he knew and loved so well. Still, Dr Schalfejew in his modest study gives a good idea of the manner in which the poet has 'gone to the people.' A useful bibliography is given, including much that bears but remotely on Koltsóv. The occasional transcription, on a German basis, of parts of the text of the poems has a curious appearance, but it is possible that some German students of Russian literature may find such a transcription easier to read than the Russian. If so, Dr Schalfejew will have earned their gratitude.

W. J. S.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

September—November, 1911.

GENERAL.

Busse, B., Das Drama, II. Von Versailles bis Weimar. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 288.) Leipzig, Teubner. 1 M.

Mackenzie, A. S., The Evolution of Literature. London, Murray. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Moriarty, W. D., The Function of Suspense in the Catharsis. Ann Arbor, Mich.

Northup, C. S., The Present Bibliographical Status of Modern Philology. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2*s.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Baillière, P., Poètes lyriques d'Italie et d'Espagne. Préface de G. Deschamps. Paris, Lemerre. 3 fr. 50.

D'Ancona, A., Viaggiatori e avventurieri. Florence, Sansoni. 5 L.

Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott. 2 vols. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press. 7 dol. 50.

Latin.

Mantuanus, B., The Eclogues of. Edited by W. P. Mustard. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press. 1 dol. 50.

Italian.

Ariosto, L., Orlando furioso secondo le stampe del 1516 e del 1521 rivedute dall' autore. Riproduzione a cura di F. Ermini. Vol. II. Rome, E. Loescher. 40 L.

Barboni, L., Geni e capi ameni dell' Ottocento: richerche e ricordi intimi. Florence, Bemporad. 3 L. 50.

Berchet, G., Opere, a cura di E. Bellorini. Vol. I. Poesie. (Scrittori d' Italia, XVIII.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Carroll, J. S., In Patria. An Exposition of Dante's Paradiso. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Della Porta, G. B., Le commedie a cura di V. Spampanato. Vol. II. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXI.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Filomusi, G. L., Nuovi studii su Dante. Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 8 L.

Finzi, G., Histoire de la littérature italienne des origines à nos jours, trad. par Mme Thiérard-Baudrillart. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

Flecker, J. E., The Scholar's Italian Book. An Introduction to the study of the Latin origins of Italian. London, Nutt. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Grazzini, A. F. (Il Lasca), Scritti in prosa e in poesia, con introduzione e note di R. Fornaciari. (Biblioteca scolastica di classici italiani.) Florence, Sansoni. 2 L. 20.

Hauvette, H., Dante, introduction à l'étude de la Divine comédie. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Holbrook, R. T., Portraits of Dante, from Giotto to Raffael. A critical study. London, Lee Warner. 21*s.* net.

Jones, F. N., Boccaccio and his Imitators. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press (Cambridge, Univ. Press). 2*s.* net.

Laudi inedite dei Disciplinati umbri, scelte di sui codici più antichi da G. Galli. (Bibl. storica della letteratura italiana, x.) Bergamo, Istituto ital. d' arti grafiche. 10 L.

Lettere autobiografiche di scrittori dell' età moderna, scelte e commentate da L. di Francia. (Biblioteca scolastica di classici italiani.) Florence, Sansoni. 4 L.

Marletta, F., Il 'Trolio e Griselda' di Angelo Leonica. Contributo alla storia della varia fortuna del Boccaccio. Catania, Giannotta. 2 L.

Micheli, P. E., Francesco Redi letterato e poeta: saggio. Florence, Le Monnier. 3 L.

Per la Lingua d' Italia, di Isidoro Del Lungo, Ernesto Monaci, Pasquale Villari, Ferdinando Martini. Florence, Casa editr. italiana. 2 L.

Petrarch's secret; or the Soul's conflict with passion. Three Dialogues between himself and St Augustine. Transl. from the Latin by W. H. Draper. London, Chatto and Windus. 6*s.* net.

Studî letterari e linguistici dedicati a Pio Raina nel 40° anno del suo insegnamento. Scritti di 48 autori. Milan, Hoepli. 35 L.

Vico, G. B., L' autobiografia, il carteggio e le poesie varie, a cura di B. Croce. (Scrittori d' Italia, xi.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

French.

(*a*) *Old French.*

Faral, E., Courtois d'Arras, jeu du XIII^e^ siècle. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 80 c.

Paris, G., La vie de Saint Alexis, poème du XI^e^ siècle. Nouv. édition, rev. par M. Roques. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 1 fr. 50.

(*b*) *Modern French.*

Allem, M., Alfred de Musset. (La vie anecdotique et pittoresque des grands écrivains, xiii.) Paris, L. Michaud. 2 fr. 25.

Benoist, A., Le théâtre d'aujourd'hui. M. Donnay, P. Hervieu, Brieux, H. Lavedan, J. Lemaître. Paris, Soc. franç. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

Bossuet, J. B., Correspondance. 4 Tomes. Paris, Hachette. Each 7 fr. 50.

Bossuet, J. B., Œuvres choisies. 5 vols. Paris, Hachette. Each 1 fr. 25.

Bossuet, J. B., Œuvres choisies, avec introduction, bibliographie, notes, par J. Calvet. Paris, Hatier. 4 fr. 50.

Boyd, W., The Educational Theory of J. J. Rousseau. London, Longmans. 5*s.* net.

Brizeux, A., Œuvres, nouv. édit. par A. Dorchain. Tome iii. Paris, Garnier frères. 3 fr.

Buffenoir, H., Les Charmettes et J. J. Rousseau. Édition définitive. Paris, E. Paul. 2 fr.

Cabeen, C. W., L'influence de G. B. Marino sur la littérature française dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr.

Cassagne, A., La vie politique de F. de Chateaubriand. Tome I. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 7 fr. 50.

Champion, P., Vie de Charles d'Orléans. (Bibl. du XV^e siècle, XIII.) Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

Chinard, G., L'Exotisme américain dans la littérature française du XVI^e siècle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Duclaux, Mme, The French Ideal: Pascal, Fénelon and other Essays. London, Chapman and Hall. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Flaubert, G., Œuvres complètes. Bouvard et Pécuchet, suivi du Dictionnaire des idées reçues. Paris, L. Conard. 8 fr.

Hamel, F., Jean de la Fontaine. London, S. Paul. 16*s.* net.

Harmand, J., Madame de Genlis, sa vie intime et politique (1746–1830) Paris, Perrin. 5 fr.

Hugo, V., Œuvres complètes. Tome XXI. Paris, Ollendorff. 20 fr.

Maigron, L., Le romantisme et la mode. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Oulmont, Ch., Étude sur la langue de P. Gringoire. (Bibl. du XV^e siècle, XV.) Paris, H. Champion. 4 fr.

Oulmont, Ch., La poésie morale, politique et dramatique à la veille de la Renaissance. Pierre Gringoire. (Bibl. du XV^e siècle, XIV.) Paris, H. Champion. 7 fr. 50.

Oulmont, Ch., Les débats du clerc et du chevalier dans la littérature poétique du moyen âge, édit. historique et littéraire. Paris, H. Champion. 6 fr.

Paris, G., Penseurs et poètes. J. Darmesteter, F. Mistral, Sully Prud'homme, A. Bida, E. Renan, A. Sorel. Paris, Calmann-Levy. 3 fr. 50.

Pellisson, M., Les hommes de lettres au XVIII^e siècle. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Racine, J., Œuvres inconnues, découvertes à la Bibliothèque impériale de St. Pétersbourg, par J. Bonnet. Archevêché d'Auch. 10 fr.

Rigal, E., De Jodelle à Molière. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Robertson, D. M., A History of the French Academy, 1635–1910. London, F. Unwin. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Rochette, A., L'esprit dans les œuvres poétiques de V. Hugo. Paris, H. Champion. 6 fr.

Rosset, Th., Entretien, doutes, critique et remarques du Père Bonhours sur la langue française (1671–92). Paris, A. Colin. 7 fr. 50.

Rosset, Th., Les origines de la prononciation moderne, étudiées au XVII^e siècle. Paris, A. Colin. 10 fr.

Rostand, E., Œuvres complètes. 5 Tomes. Paris, Lafitte. Each 12 fr.

Rousseau, J. B., Épigrammes, publiées sur les recueils manuscrits. Paris, Sansot. 4 fr.

Séché, L., Études d'histoire romantique. Les amitiés de Lamartine. 1^re série. Paris, Mercure de France. 7 fr. 50.

Thomas, E., M. Maeterlinck. London, Methuen. 5*s.* net.

Vinet, A., Études sur la littérature française au XIX^e siècle. Tome I. Mme de Staël et Chateaubriand. Paris, Fischbacher. 8 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Gothic.

KLUGE, F., Die Elemente des Gotischen. (Paul's Grundriss der germanischer Philologie, 3. Aufl.) Strassburg, Trübner. 2 M. 25.

Scandinavian.

AASEN, I., Skrifter i Samling, trykt og utrykt. I. Hefte. Kristiania, Gyldendal. 50 ö.

BJÖRNSON, B., Aulestadbreve til Bergliot Ibsen. Kristiania, Gyldendal. 3 Kr. 70.

GOSSE, E., Two Visits to Denmark. London, Smith Elder. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

GRAVERSEN, H., Salmedigteren Thomas Kingo. En folkelig Fremstilling. Copenhagen, Indre Missions Forening. 1 Kr.

JUDD, F. A., Under the Swedish Colours: a short Anthology of Modern Swedish Poets. London, E. Matthews. 1*s.* net.

KIERKEGAARD, S., Papirer. Udgivne af P. A. Herberg og V. Kuhr. III. Bind. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 7 Kr.

MAYRHOFER, J., H. Ibsen. Ein literarisches Charakterbild. Berlin, Walther. 3 M.

MORTENSEN, J., Clas Livijns dramatiska författarskap. Stockholm, Bonnier. 10 Kr.

OEHLENSCHLÄGER, A., St Hans Aften Spil. Med Oplysninger udgivet af Dansklaererforeningen ved S. Gundel. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 60 ö.

PETTERSEN, H., Bibliotheca Norvegica. III. Norske Forfattere for 1814. Besknvende Katalog over deres værker. I. del. Kristiania, Cammermeyer. 45 Kr.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. II. Collected by H. C. Beeching. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

REIN, W., Die Mass- und Gewichtsbezeichnungen des Englischen. (Diss. Giessen.) Giessen, Heffeler und Meyer.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

COURMONT, A., Studies on Lydgate's Syntax in the Temple of Glass. (Bibl. de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Univ. de Paris, XXVIII.) Paris, Alcan. 5 fr.

PATTERSON, F. A., The Middle English Penitential Lyric. A Study and Collection of Early Religious Verse. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English.) New York, Lemcke and Büchner; London, H. Frowde. 1 dol. 50 net.

Recluse, The, a Fourteenth Century Version of the Ancren Riwle, edited by J. Påhlsson. (Lunds Universitets Aarsskrift. N.F., Afd. I. Bd. 6. No. 1.) Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup. 5 Kr.

ROBIN, P. ANSELL, The Old Physiology in English Literature. London, Dent. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROYSTER, J. F., A Middle English Treatise on the Ten Commandments. Part II. Introduction. (North Carolina Studies in Philology, Vol. VIII.) Chapel Hill, Univ. Press.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

BACON, LORD, Essays. Edited with Introduction and Notes by A. S. Gaye. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3*s.*

BADSTUBER, A., Joanna Baillie's Plays of the Passions. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXIV.) Vienna, Braumüller. 5 Kr.

BAILEY, J., Poets and Poetry. Being Articles reprinted from the Literary Supplement of the Times. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

BARDI, P., Scrittori inglesi dell' ottocento. Bari, Laterza. 4 L.

COOK, E. T., The Life of Ruskin. 2 vols. London, G. Allen. 21*s.* net.

COOPER, LANE, A Concordance to the Poems of William Wordsworth. London, Smith Elder. 42*s.* net.

DIXON, W. MACNEILE, Thomas the Rhymer. Glasgow, Maclehose. 1*s.* net.

DOREN, C. VAN, The Life of Thomas Love Peacock. London, Dent. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

FIGGIS, D., Shakespeare : a Study. London, Dent. 5*s.* net.

FORSTER, J., The Life of Charles Dickens. Collected, arranged and annotated by B. W. Matz. 2 vols. Memorial Edition. London, Chapman and Hall. 25*s.* net.

Furnivall, F. J., A Volume of Personal Record. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

GRAY, TH., Essays and Criticisms. Edited by C. S. Northup. (Belles Lettres Series.) Boston, D. C. Heath (London, Harrap). 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

GOYSEK, S. VON, Milton und Caedmon. (Wiener Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, XXXV.) Vienna, Braumüller. 2 M.

GREENE, B. R.—R. B., Newes both from Heauen and Hell, 1593, and Greene's Funeralls, 1594. Reprinted with Notes, etc. by R. B. McKerrow. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 5*s.* net.

GRIBBLE, F., The Romantic Life of Shelley and the sequel. London, Nash. 15*s.* net.

HARRIS, F., The Women of Shakespeare. London, Methuen. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

JUSSERAND, J. J., What to expect of Shakespeare. (First Annual Shakespeare Lecture, British Academy.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1*s.* net.

KNECHT, J., Die Kongruenz zwischen Subjekt und Prädikat und die 3. Person Pluralis Präsentis auf -s im Elisabethinischen Englisch. (Anglistische Forschungen, XXXIII.) Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 20.

LOW, S., De Quincey. (Masters of Literature.) London, Bell. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

MAIR, G. H., English Literature : Modern. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s.* net.

MEAKIN, A. M. B., Hannah More : a biographical study. London, Smith Elder. 14*s.* net.

MELVILLE, L., The Life and Letters of L. Sterne. 2 vols. London, S. Paul. 28*s.* net.

MORGAN, C. E., The Rise of the Novel of Manners. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1 dol. 25 net.

NEILSON, W. A., The Chief Elizabethan Dramatists (excluding Shakespeare). Selected plays with notes, etc. London, Cassell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

NICATI, W., Femme et poète. Elisabeth Browning. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

SAINTSBURY, G., A History of English Criticism. Edinburgh, Blackwood. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

SAXELBY, F. O., A Thomas Hardy Dictionary. London, Routledge. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

SCHIPPER, J., James Shirley. Sein Leben und seine Werke. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXVI.) Vienna, Braumüller. 14 M.

SHELLEY, P. B., Poems. Edited with notes by C. D. Locock. 2 vols. London, Methuen. 21*s.* net.

Sidgwick, F., Legendary Ballads. With an Introduction. London, Chatto and Windus. 3*s.* net.

Simpson, P., Shakespearian Punctuation. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

Stevenson, R. L., Letters. Edited by S. Colvin. New Edition. 4 vols. London, Methuen. 20*s.*

Swift, J., Correspondence. Edited by E. E. Ball. Vol. II. London, Bell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Taylor, R., The Political Prophecy in England. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1 dol. 25 net.

Tuckwell, W., Lycidas. A Monograph. London, Murray. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Walters, J. C., Phases of Dickens, the man, his message and his mission. London, Chapman and Hall. 5*s.* net.

Watt, H. A., Gorbuduc; or Ferrex and Porrex. (Bulletin of the Univ. of Wisconsin, No. 351. Phil. and Lit. Series, Vol. v. No. 1.) Madison, Wisconsin. 40 c.

Weaver, J., Epigrammes in the Oldest Cut and Newest Fashion, 1599. Reprinted with notes etc., by R. B. McKerrow. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 5*s.* net.

Weston, J. L., Old English Carols from the Hill MS. London, Nutt. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wilkins, W. G., Charles Dickens in America. London, Chapman and Hall. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Young, W. A., A Dictionary of the Characters and Scenes in the Stories and Poems of Rudyard Kipling, 1886–1911. London, Routledge. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Abegg, E., Die Mundart von Urseren. (Beiträge zur schweizerdeutschen Grammatik, IV.) Frauenfeld, Huber. 2 fr. 50.

Enderlin, F., Die Mundart von Kesswil in Oberthurgau. (Beiträge zur schweizerdeutschen Grammatik, V.) Frauenfeld, Huber. 3 fr. 60.

Grimm, J. und W., Deutsche Sagen. Einleitung von A. Stoll. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 1 M. 50.

Weller, A., Die Sprache in den ältesten deutschen Urkunden des deutschen Ordens. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XXXIX.) Breslau, M. und H. Marcus. 4 M. 40.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Minnesangs Frühling, Des. Neu bearbeitet von F. Vogt. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 7 M.

Ochs, E., Lautstudien zu Notker von St Gallen. Freiburg, Troemer. 2 M.

Oppel, A., Das Hohelied Salomonis und die deutsche religiöse Liebeslyrik. (Leipziger historische Abhandlungen, XXXII.) Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 2 M. 50.

Rank, O., Die Lohengrinsage. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Motivgestaltung und Deutung. (Schriften zur angewandten Seelenkunde, XIII.) Vienna, Deuticke. 5 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Alt, K., Goethe und seine Zeit. (Wissenschaft und Bildung, XCIX.) Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 1 M.

Appelmann, A., Der fünffüssige Iambus bei O. Ludwig, mit Beiträgen zur Textkritik, Sprache und Stoffgeschichte. Münster, A. Greve. 5 M. 60.

Arnim, A. von, Werke. Ausgewählt und herausg. von R. Steig. 3 Bände. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. Each 3 M.

Baumgartner, A., Goethe. Sein Leben und seine Werke. 3. Aufl. 1. Band. Freiburg, Herder. 10 M.

Beyer, P., Der junge Heine. Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte seiner Denkweise und Dichtung. (Bonner Forschungen, 1.) Berlin, Grote. 5 M.

Bieber, H., J. A. Schlegels poetische Theorie in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange untersucht. Teil 1. (Berlin Diss.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller.

Blanc, M., Étude littéraire sur les élégies romaines de Goethe. Paris, Berger-Levrault. 3 fr. 50.

Bobeth, J., Die Zeitschriften der Romantik. Leipzig, Haessel. 8 M.

Bode, W., Die Tonkunst in Goethes Leben. 2 Bände. Berlin, E. S. Mittler. 9 M.

Brahm, O., Das Leben Heinrich von Kleists. Neue Ausgabe. Berlin, E. Fleischel. 6 M.

Brecht, W., Heinse und der ästhetische Immoralismus. Zur Geschichte der italienischen Renaissance in Deutschland. Berlin, Weidmann. 6 M.

Büchner, W., Goethe's Faust. Eine Analyse der Dichtung. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M.

Ehrenhaus, M., Die Operndichtung der deutschen Romantik. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, xxix.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 2 M. 50.

Fiedler, H. G., The Oxford Book of German Verse from the 12th to the 20th century. With a Preface by G. Hauptmann. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6*s.* net.

Fischer, H., Die schwäbische Literatur im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Ein historischer Rückblick. Tübingen, H. Laupp. 3 M. 60.

Geiger, P., Volksliedinteresse und Volksliedforschung in der Schweiz vom Anfang des 18. Jahrh. bis zum Jahre 1830. Bern, A. Francke. 3 fr. 50.

Gloege, G., Novalis' 'Heinrich von Ofterdingen' als Ausdruck seiner Persönlichkeit. Eine ästhetisch-psychologische Stiluntersuchung. (Teutonia, xx.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 4 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Götter, Helden und Wieland, nach der Hs. herausg. von K. Wolff. Leipzig, Rowohlt. 30 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Werke. Herausg. im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen. 1. Abt., 51. und 52. Band. Weimar, H. Böhlau. Each 5 M. 60.

Goethe, J. W. von, Wilhelm Meisters Theatralische Sendung. Herausg. von H. Mayne. Stuttgart, Cotta. 38 M. (Popular edition, 2 M.)

Gutzkow, K., Werke, herausg. von P. Müller. 3. und 4. Band. Leipzig, Bibliograph. Institut. Each 2 M.

Hamerling, R., Sämtliche Werke in 16 Bänden. Herausg. von M. M. Rabenlechner. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 8 M.

Harnack, O., Aufsätze und Vorträge. Tübingen, Mohr. 7 M.

Hartmann, M., L. A. von Arnim als Dramatiker. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, xxiv.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 3 M. 40.

Herzog, W., Heinrich von Kleist. Sein Leben und sein Werk. Munich, Beck. 6 M. 50.

Houben, H. H., Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang. Ergebnisse und Studien. Leipzig, Brockhaus. 10 M.

Humboldt, W. von, Neue Briefe an Schiller, 1796–1803. Herausg. von C. Ebrard. Berlin, Paetel. 4 M.

Hünich, F. A., Das Fortleben des älteren Volksliedes im Kirchenliede des 17. Jahrh. (Probefahrten, xxi.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 1 M. 80.

Jacoby, G., Herder als Faust. Eine Untersuchung. Leipzig, Meiner. 7 M.

Kleist, H. von in seinen Briefen. Eine Charakteristik seines Lebens und Schaffens. Herausg. von E. Schur. Charlottenburg, Schiller-Buchhandlung. 2 M.

Köhler, W., C. F. Meyer als religiöser Charakter. Jena, Diederichs. 4 M.

Kürnberger, F., Gesammelte Werke. Herausg. von O. E. Deutsch. II. Band. Munich, G. Müller. 6 M.

Lahnstein, E., Hebbels Jugenddramen und ihre Probleme. Berlin-Zehlendorf, B. Behr. 3 M.

Lessing, G. E., Werke, herausg. von G. Witkowski. 7 Bände. Leipzig, Bibl. Institut. 14 M.

Lienhard, F., Wege nach Weimar. Beiträge zur Erneuerung des Idealismus. 6. Bd. Goethe. Stuttgart, Greiner und Pfeiffer. 3 M. 50.

Liliencron, D. von, Gesammelte Werke. Herausg. von R. Dehmel. In 8 Bänden. I.—III. Band. Berlin, Schuster und Loeffler. Each 4 M.

Lorm, H., Ausgewählte Briefe. Eingeleitet und herausg. von E. Friedegg. Berlin, K. Siegismund. 4 M.

Luterbacher, O., Die Landschaft in G. Kellers Prosawerken. (Sprache und Dichtung, VIII.) Tübingen, Mohr. 3 M.

Luther, M., Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. XLV. Band. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 23 M. 40.

Meyer, C., Die Romane von F. von Uechtritz. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, XXVI.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 2 M. 50.

Moschner, A., Holtei als Dramatiker. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, XXVIII.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 4 M. 60.

Nestroy, J., Ausgewählte Werke. Herausg. von F. Brukner. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 1 M. 50.

Noch, C., Grillparzers 'Ahnfrau' und die Wiener Volksdramatik. Leipzig, Wiegandt. 1 M. 20.

Riess, E., W. Heinses Romantechnik. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, XXXIX.) Weimar, Duncker. 3 M. 60.

Röhr, J., G. Hauptmanns dramatisches Schaffen. Eine Studie. Dresden, Pierson. 4 M.

Schubert, E., A. Bohse genannt Talander. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der galanten Zeit in Deutschland. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, XXVII.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 3 M.

Soergel, A., Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit. Eine Schilderung der deutschen Literatur der letzten Jahrzehnte. Leipzig, Voigtländer. 10 M. 50.

Splettstösser, W., Der Grundgedanke in Goethes Faust. Berlin, G. Reimer. 3 M. 50.

Stern, L., Die Varnhagen von Ensesche Sammlung in der kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, geordnet und verzeichnet. Berlin, Behrend. 15 M.

Stierling, H., Leben und Bildnis Friedrichs von Hagedorn. (Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für hamburgische Geschichte, XXVIII.) Hamburg, Gräfe und Sillem. 8 M.

Storm, G., Theodor Storm. Ein Bild seines Lebens. Jugendzeit. Berlin, Curtius. 3 M. 50.

Szymanzig, M., Immermanns Tristan und Isolde. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, XVII.) Marburg, Elwert. 4 M. 50.

Trösch, E., Die helvetische Revolution im Lichte der deutsch-schweizerischen Dichtung. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, X.) Leipzig, Haessel. 4 M. 60.

Wildenbruch, E. von, Gesammelte Werke. Herausg. von B. Litzmann. In 17 Bänden. I. und II. Band. Berlin, Grote. Each 4 M.

CHAUCER'S 'MILLERES TALE.'

VARNHAGEN[1] was the first to observe that in this tale two different jests have been blended into one: (1) the jest of the man who let himself be scared by the prediction of a second flood, and (2) the story of the smith who, expecting to kiss his sweetheart's mouth, was made to kiss his rival's posteriors, on which he avenged himself with a red-hot iron from his smithy. The second jest alone is found as a separate story in Italian and French, just the very languages in which the tale as it is told by Chaucer, Hans Sachs[2] and Schumann, has not yet been traced. Its earliest occurrence is in the Novellino of Masuccio Salernitano (1476), where it stands as the twenty-ninth novel. The unknown collector of the *Contes du monde aventureux,* who signs himself A. D. S. D., borrowed the tale either from the Novellino or from the *Cento Novelli* (1561) of Sansovino, who probably took it from Masuccio. For other versions of what might be called the Masuccio type I may refer to Bolte's notes to his edition of Schumann's *Nachtbüchlein*[3].

I do not think that attention has ever been drawn to the fact that in this Masuccio type of the story the number of the nocturnal visitors is never less than three, with the sole exception of Brewer's jest[4]. But the latter also differs from the continental versions in that he makes the smith appear unexpectedly at the window, whereas all the other tales of the Masuccio type agree as to his appearing there by appointment. Both divergencies, together with the fact that this isolated form of the tale is found in England, make it very probable that Brewer retold the Masuccio story with the help of Chaucer's 'Milleres Tale.' He certainly did not follow Chaucer alone, for his smith proves his acquaintance with a more original form of the plot.

Was Chaucer the first to insert the episode of the man in the tub into this story of the smith's hapless love adventure? The assumption is

[1] *Anglia*, VII, Anzeiger, 81.

[2] 'Der schmit im pachdrog,' H. Sachs, *Sämtliche Fabeln und Schwänke*, 3. Bd. in *Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des* XVI. *u.* XVII. *Jh.* 39—40.

[3] Lit. Ver., Stuttgart, 1893.

[4] See Proescholdt, *Anglia*, VII, 116.

not particularly convincing in the face of the sixteenth century versions of Sachs and Schumann, who, we may be sure, knew nothing of Chaucer. The missing link between the tale as it is told by these three and the story of the Masuccio type will have to be sought in France, although no trace of a *fabliau* based on this blended plot has as yet been discovered. But there exists a very interesting version of it in a Middle Dutch story, which constitutes a transitional form between Masuccio and Chaucer. This *fabliau*, or 'boerde' as it is called in Dutch, is found in the so-called Thorpe MS. of the Royal Library at Brussels, written, presumably, in the second half of the fourteenth century. The Flemish poet tells the story exactly as we know it from Masuccio, but he inserts the episode of the man in the tub. He agrees with the Italian novelist in the following three points, which have no counterpart in the tales of Chaucer, Sachs and Schumann: (1) The woman, whose name is Heile, receives three visitors in the same night at appointed hours. (2) The first of them is obliged to conceal himself at the arrival of the second visitor, a priest. (3) The smith is the next-door neighbour of the woman.

On the other hand, the Flemish poet agrees with Chaucer and the German versions in inserting the flood episode. But this insertion has been carried out in such a clumsy, awkward manner that even a negligent reader, who does not know the Masuccio version, is bound to discover its defects. Instead of hiding himself in the projecting part of the window (as in Masuccio), the first lover is told by Heile to climb into a tub which hangs down from the rafters. Not until his fear of being seen by the priest has driven him into this hiding-place comes the prediction of the flood to add to his agitation. For the priest, having done his business, treats the wench to a prophecy of the tremendous judgment of God, who would soon destroy the earth by water and fire. The other lover in his tub hears everything he says and, after long contemplation, arrives at the conclusion that the priest may be right, as the Gospel confirms his prediction. The events that follow do not differ materially from those in the other versions: the smith appears at the appointed hour; the priest plays his practical joke on him and is punished for it by the application of the hot iron. On hearing him cry for water, the man in the tub, believing the flood to be rising, cuts the ropes, and breaks an arm and a thighbone in his fall. The priest takes him for the devil and jumps aside, unfortunately into a latrine. So each of the three comes to harm for his dealings with the woman, and the poet concludes with a warning to all lechers.

The concealment motive of the Masuccio version is retained in the Middle Dutch 'boerde.' But the insertion of the flood motive required the substitution of the tub for the projecting window as a hiding-place. The possibility of a more thorough blending of the two motives forces itself upon even an indifferent reader of the 'boerde.' The originals of Chaucer, Sachs and Schumann must have been closely related versions of a considerably improved redaction of the story as preserved in the Middle Dutch 'boerde': the first visitor, who was foolish enough to take the priest's words for a serious prophecy, and the cry of 'water!' for a cry of despair at its actual fulfilment, such a man was a splendid figure for a cuckold, that favourite character of the medieval *fabliau*. So, in a later French redaction, the first visitor of the Flemish 'boerde' was transformed into the husband of the woman. But this alteration involved the loss of the hiding motive, for a husband would have no reason to conceal himself at the approach of his wife's lover. The priest's prediction, consequently, became the cause of the husband's sleeping in the tub. Nothing would have been more natural than to represent the prediction of the flood as an intentional lie, invented in order to get rid of the jealous husband. Schumann, however, has retained the original trait of the Flemish story and its supposed French original, that the prophecy is pronounced in good faith without any wicked intentions. For in his *Nachtbüchlein* the pastor who preaches the sermon and the nocturnal visitor of the merchant's wife are two different individuals. Schumann and the Flemish poet agree in yet another point, which does not occur in any other version: the priest of the 'boerde' predicts that 'God will destroy the world both with water and with fire,' and Schumann's rich merchant hears in church 'das der predicant saget, wie es zur zeyt des jüngsten tags wurde zugehen, das es da wurde feür regnen und verbrennen alles, was auff erden were, unnd was das feür wurde uber lassen, das wurde das wasser erseüffen.'

Our supposed French *fabliau* cannot have been an improved redaction of the Flemish poem, but must have been based upon the latter's French original. For in a few details Chaucer, Sachs and Schumann agree with the Masuccio story, whereas the Flemish poet states the facts under consideration in a slightly different way. The latter represents the woman as being unmarried and a common prostitute, differing therein from Masuccio, who calls her the wife of a well-to-do carpenter. The first nocturnal visitor is a merchant in Masuccio, a miller in the Middle Dutch story. It is possible that of our supposed French *fabliau* two versions existed side by side: one, in which the craft

of the original husband mentioned by Masuccio was attributed to the new husband into whom the first of the three visitors had been transformed; the other version representing him as a merchant, which he was before this transformation had been carried out. The former of these two hypothetical versions would have been the original of Chaucer's tale, in which silly John is called a carpenter; on the latter Schumann would have based his 'Schwank,' in which the husband is a merchant like Viola's first lover. Hans Sachs makes the husband a smith, in the German 'Schwankbücher' and in the Latin poem of Cropacius he is called a farmer.

The conclusion which I feel confident may be drawn from the above enquiry is this. The Middle Dutch 'boerde,' probably a translation of a French *fabliau*, represents the earliest and most original type of the blending of the flood motive with the story of the Masuccio type. The number of both Viola's and Heile's lovers is three and the episode of the first lover hiding himself at the approach of the second is common to the Italian novel and the 'boerde.' Of this type of the blended story, solely represented by the Flemish poem, a more artistic redaction must have existed, in which the first of the three lovers appeared as the woman's husband and, consequently, the hiding motive had been replaced by that of the new husband sleeping in the tub, for fear of a flood which he had heard a priest predict to his flock (source of Schumann). A still better revision identified the prophet with the lecherous priest, so that the husband's fear of being drowned was not a mere accident favourable to another man's wicked designs about his wife, but the wished for result of a well laid scheme (the source of Chaucer, Sachs, Cropacius, and the German 'Schwankbücher').

By thus assuming that the flood episode in the 'Milleres Tale' and in the German versions mentioned above developed out of the hiding motive in the Masuccio version, a satisfactory explanation is gained for the husband's otherwise unaccountable indifference about his wife's fate in the apprehended flood. Chaucer alone noticed this flaw in the plot: the three tubs of the 'Milleres Tale' are doubtless of his own invention, and by this he gave the finishing touch to this greatly altered story[1].

A. J. Barnouw.

The Hague.

[1] I am aware of the fact that in the tale of the South-Hungarian gipsies communicated by H. von Wlislocki in Koch's *Zs. f. vergl. Litteraturgesch.* N. F. II, 191, we possess another version in which three tubs are mentioned. But this tale seems to be ultimately based upon Chaucer's.

'ELEGY ON THE DEATH OF KING EDWARD I.'

From a new MS.

In a former communication (see Vol. VI, p. 455) I gave the text of the fragments of *Havelok* found in MS. 4407 (19) in the Cambridge University Library. With them are preserved three fragments of the 'Elegy on the Death of Edward I,' known hitherto from the copy preserved in MS. Harl. 2253 (fol. 73), printed in Wright's *Political Songs*, pp. 246—250, in Böddeker's *Altenglische Dichtungen*, pp. 140—143, and in Percy's *Reliques of Ancient Poetry*, Series II, Book I. As these three prints are all from the same manuscript original, I presume that no other copy has hitherto been discovered.

Nevertheless, there was certainly once another copy, as we have here the fragments of it. I therefore give below a transcript of them. There are in all *three* fragments, on the scraps marked *a*, *b*, *c*. Of these, *a* contains ll. 6—12; *b*, ll. 20—29 (omitting l. 24); and *c*, ll. 83—88 (with four lines more). It ought to be observed that this English Elegy is a loose translation of a French Elegy of the same date (1307); the latter is printed in Wright's *Political Songs*, pp. 241—245.

(*a*) Of qwom þat god haued don is wille: 6
Me þenketh þat deþe haue don vs wrong,
þat he so sone schal liggen stille.

Engelond, þou aghtes wel to knowe
Of qwom þat I þis song schal singe; 10
Of oure king, þat lith so lowe,
þorgh alle þis word his name gan springe. 12

(*b*) I charde[1] 3ou deplike and sare 20
þat 3e to engelon[d] ben trewe;
I deye, I may be king no mare,
Helpyt my sone, and corunnith hym newe.
[*Last line of stanza missing.*]

[1] *For* charge.

¶ I be-queþe myn herte wel rith,
It hathe ben wreten in my deing[1],
Ouer þe se þat it be dyth,
With seuenscore knigtes al of pris,
Of werre þat þei ben ware and wis.

(*c*) Þe tende ne mith [I neuer telle],
Þe godhed, wyt king[2] edwar (*sic*) was.
* Nou is he ded, allas! allas!
* God ȝiue his soule rest and ro!
* Seynt Edwar and saint Thomas,
* His huerde[3] bere ȝe þer-to.

¶ louerd, als he was conquerur
In ich a batayle, and hadde þe pris,
Þou ȝeue his soule mechil onur,
And brinkyt[4] into heuene blis.

I add a few remarks. The insertion of 'þat' in l. 6 improves the metre. Ll. 9 and 10 are improvements. In l. 23, read 'Helpeth'; and 'crowneth'='crown'th.' L. 26 should be 'It hath ben writen in my deuis'; which seems better than the other version. In l. 27, this version has 'it,' i.e. my heart; the other version has 'hue,' i.e. 'she,' because 'herte' was feminine. Bishop Percy made the singular mistake of printing 'Hue' with a capital letter, as if it were a man's name, with the footnote:—'The name of the person who was to preside over this business.' In l. 28, the other copy has 'fourscore; but seuen score' is right. Warton, *Hist. of E. Poetry*, ed. Hazlitt, vol. II, p. 105, has:—'in his last moments he devoted the prodigious sum of thirty thousand pounds to provide *one hundred and forty knights*, who should carry his heart into Palestine.' It is interesting to find that this correction of the Elegy has the authority of our MS. In l. 83, I suppose 'þe tende' to mean 'the tenth part,' 'the tithe'; i.e. 'as to the goodness that was with king Edward, I could never recount the tithe of it.' The introduction of four new lines after l. 84 is curious; the word 'ro,' i.e. rest, is not very common. Ll. 85—88 are certainly better in this new copy.

Fragment (*g*) contains scraps of a poem unknown to me, but it is of no merit. I quote a stanza to show the metre.

[1] *An error for* deuis. [2] god; *with* king *written above it.*
[3] *With the* u *above, between* h *and* e, *for* huerte (heart).
[4] *For* bryng yt.

In þis werd þat hys so wicke
I ne mai no st[u]nde abide;
For mischances arne so þicke
And reueleke it be-tide;
Wylum haued I fere *and* flicke,
God hors on to ride;
Nou hys min hors a wrechyd sticke
þat stondit be my seyde (*sic*).

Note 'werd' for 'werld' (world); 'reueleke,' ruefully; after 'it' insert 'mot' (must) or something of the kind; 'wylum,' whilom; 'fere and flicke,' companion and lass.

The one gain here is the extremely rare word 'flicke,' of which no example is given either in Stratmann or in the *New English Dictionary*. It obviously represents the Swedish *flicka*, a girl, a lass.

Fragment (*h*), the eighth and last, gives us another MS. authority for the commencement of the *Proverbs of Hendyng*. Of this interesting poem I quote all that appears here. It most resembles the copy in MS. Harl. 2253. See Böddeker (as above), p. 287.

[*First line missing.*]
At wis hen[d]ing he may leren
þat was marcolfes sone;
Gode þankes and manie þeues
For to wissen oþere schrewes
þerto was euere hys wone. 6
[*First proverb omitted.*]
¶ Wyt and wysdum lerneþ ȝerne, 15
And loke þat noman oþir werne
To ben wis *and* hende.
For betere it were to ben wys
þan for to weren veir or gris,
Wer so man schal ende. 20
¶ Wyt and wysdom is gode warisun:
q[uod hendi]ng.
Ne may noman in his owen londe 23
For no þink þat he can fonde
Wone at hom *and* speden; 25
So feles þewes for to leren
So he þat haueth w[is?] *and* dere
...in fele þedom.

Also fele þedes, also fele þewes:
quod hen[d]ing.
Be þe schil ye euere so dere,
And it wele wantonnesse lere,
Þou bet it oþir wile;
For if it mote haue alle is wille,
Wiltou niltou, it schal spille,
And become a file.

In l. 5, 'wissen' is a good reading. In l. 19, 'veir' is for 'vair,' a valuable fur; the Harl. MS. has 'foh.' In l. 28, 'þedom' is wrong; the plural of 'þede' is wanted. In l. 31, 'schil ye' is an error for 'child.' In l. 32, 'wantonnesse' is not so good as 'unþewes.' The last word 'file' corrects the reading 'fule' in the Harl. MS.

Walter W. Skeat.

Cambridge.

THE ITALIAN SOURCES OF DANIEL'S 'DELIA.'

I PROPOSE in the following note to make various additions and corrections to what has already been written concerning the Italian sources of Daniel's *Delia*[1]. It has so far escaped attention that Sonnet XXVII of *Delia*, which first appeared in the edition of 1594, is an adaptation and amplification in a different form of the following Italian madrigal, as appears at once from a comparison of the two compositions:

Oft do I marvel, whether Delia's eyes
Are eyes, or else two radiant stars that shine?
For how could Nature ever thus devise
Of earth, on earth, a substance so divine?
Stars, sure, they are! Whose motions rule desires;
And calm and tempest follow their aspects:
Their sweet appearing still such power inspires,
That makes the world admire so strange effects.
Yet whether fixed or wandering stars are they,
Whose influence rules the Orb of my poor heart?
Fixed, sure, are they! But wandering, make me stray
In endless errors; whence I cannot part.
Stars, then, not eyes! Move you, with milder view,
Your sweet aspect on him that honours you!

Camilla Bella

Dialogo

Amante, & Amore.

Ama. Deh dimmi Amor se gli occhi di Camilla
Son occhi, ò pur due stelle?
Amo. Sciocco, non hà possanza
Natura, à cui virtute il ciel prescrisse,
Di far luci si belle.
Ama. Son elle erranti ò fisse?
Amo. Fisse, ma de gli amanti
Fan gir (no'l proui tù) l' anime erranti.

Now the Italian piece just quoted appears in the *Rime del molto illustre signor Caualiere Battista Guarini...* Venetia, 1598, p. 117, the

[1] See Josef Guggenheim, *Quellenstudien zu Samuel Daniels Sonettencyclus 'Delia'* (Berlin Thesis), Berlin, 1898; H. Isaac (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, XVII, 181 et seq.): 'Wie weit geht die Abhängigkeit Shakespeare's von Daniel als Lyriker.'

first and only edition in collected form of Guarini's *Rime* in the sixteenth century. Some of his compositions, thirty-six sonnets and one madrigal, appeared as early as 1567 in the *Rime degli academici Eterei* (Padua), and others, fifty madrigals, in the *Rime di diversi celebri poeti dell' età nostra* (Bergamo, 1587), published and collected by G. B. Licino. The madrigal in question figures in Licino's anthology, but is there attributed not to Guarini, but to Torquato Tasso. Despite this, it appears to belong to Guarini (though Daniel need not necessarily have thought so), as the edition of 1598 of the *Rime* having been personally supervised by the author of the *Pastor Fido* would hardly have been made to include a piece that was not his own property. Daniel may have come across it in one of the numerous collections of Italian madrigals set to music issued in the sixteenth century, in which the compilers were not very particular in their attribution of the pieces. The most likely solution, however, is that Daniel, who seems to have known Guarini personally (we may safely conclude so from Daniel's commendatory sonnet to the Dymmocke translation of the *Pastor Fido*), heard the madrigal sung in Guarini's house, or had it communicated to him in some other way by Guarini at the time of his visit to Italy, undertaken probably before 1590. Personal relations with Guarini must have acted as an incentive to know his poems, and no doubt directed Daniel's attention to Guarini rather than to Tasso when the author of *Delia* subsequently tried his hand at the pastoral.

The influence of Guarini's *Rime* is also present in Sonnet XLII of *Delia*, which is fashioned on the pattern of the eighteenth sonnet of Daniel's Italian contemporary, and clearly reechoes the final conceit:

> e come
> Puo in odio hauer celeste immortal Dea
> Quel Tempio, ove s' adora il suo bel nome?

in the lines:

> Thus ruins She, to satisfy her will,
> The Temple where her name was honoured still.

Although Daniel preferred Guarini to Tasso as a model for pastoral poetry, he drew much more largely on the latter for his *Delia* sonnet-cycle. As early as 1882 H. Isaac (*op. cit.* p. 181) showed that the three sonnets (XXXIII, XXXVI, XXXVII) in which Daniel prophetically describes the havoc that old age will make upon his mistress's beauty faithfully reproduce, in spite of a few divergencies, the three sonnets of the *Rime amorose* (LVI, LVII, LVIII) in which the Italian poet attempts the same task. Mr Sidney Lee is accordingly in error when he here points

(Introduction to *Elizabethan Sonnets*, p. liv) to Ronsard as the model, although he is on the right track when he adds that 'there is a likelihood that Daniel was better read in the later Italian poetry which was produced in his own lifetime than in the Italian poetry of Petrarch,' and instances in support of his statement the piece entitled 'A Pastorall' which first appeared in the 1592 edition of *Delia* and turns out to be a literal rendering of the famous 'choro' in Tasso's *Aminta* ('O bella età de l' oro'). Whilst on the subject of Daniel's indebtedness to Tasso[1] it may be pointed out that Sonnet XXXIV of *Delia* is composed on the pattern of a passage of the *Gerusalemme Liberata* (c. XVI, 14 and 15).

The imitative habit of Daniel's sonneteering muse is further illustrated by Sonnet XXX ('And yet, I cannot reprehend the flight'), which is an adaptation of Tansillo's famous 'Amor m' impenna l' ale e tanto in alto.' In *Delia* LIV ('Unhappy pen! and ill-accepted papers!') the original is Angelo di Costanzo[2] ('Penna infelice, e mal gradito ingegno'), but the immediate model appears to have been Desportes (*Cléonice*, LVIII), with whom the Neapolitan was a particular favourite. A comparison of the closing lines in the three compositions makes this point clear, I think:

E perchè ancor di cio non si lamenti,
E ver noi più s' inaspri, abbiate cura
Che fuor non esca il suon de i mesti accenti.
Si che queste al mio mal pietose mura
Ai parti vostri, e a' miei sospiri ardenti
Sieno in un tempo culla e sepoltura.

Encor, pour n'irriter cette fière déesse,
La nuict, seul à mon lict, j'ouvriray ma tristesse,
Escrivant et tirant de mes yeux maint ruisseau;
Et ce lict, seul témoin de mes maux incurables,
Sera de tant d'escrits, mes enfans misérables,
Tout en un même tans la tombe et le berceau.

But since she scorns her own; this rests for me.
I'll moan, myself; and hide the wrong I have:
And so content me, that her frowns should be
To m' infant style, the cradle and the grave.

Desportes' 'escrits—mes enfans' is obviously reflected in Daniel's 'm' infant style' for which there is no equivalent in Costanzo's version.

[1] It may be remarked incidentally, and as germane to the general question, that the credit of having first detected the influence of Tasso on Spenser's *Amoretti* belongs to E. Koeppel (*Anglia*, XI, 36), and that consequently Fitzmaurice-Kelly's 'Note on three sonnets' (*Revue hispanique*, XII, 259, and XIII, 257) requires correction in that particular.

[2] Another imitation of A. di Costanzo (whose sonnets by the way did not appear in collected form during the sixteenth cent.) is to be found in Sonnet X of the Fifth Decade of the *Diana* of Constable (and others)—'Prometheus for stealing living fire,' which corresponds closely to Costanzo's 'Del foco che dal ciel Prometeo tolse.' In this case the imitation is direct.

In the same way certain verbal resemblances prove that Sonnet XXXIII of *Delia*, already mentioned ('I once may see, when years may wreck my wrong'), was not written without a knowledge of Desportes' adaptation (*Cléonice* LXII) of Tasso's version. These and other examples of the same kind go to strengthen Sidney Lee's view, which I share, that in general the Elizabethan sonneteers were more intimately acquainted with French than with Italian literature, and not infrequently worked on French renderings of Italian sonnets. Even Spenser, whose wide and accurate knowledge of Italian literature appears undoubted, did not despise Desportes.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

AN ANGLO-FRENCH LIFE OF SAINT OSITH[1].

Declension.

§ 43. Nouns.

We shall consider first of all the masculine nouns and shall place in a first paragraph (i) correct forms assured by the rime; in a second (ii) such forms as are rendered certain by the scansion or are correct in orthography; in a third (iii) those which may be easily altered without any detriment to rime or scansion; and in a fourth (iv) such as are proved incorrect by rime or scansion.

i. (*a*) Nom. sing. *guez* (: *passez*) 603; *sire* (: *desire*) 445; *li reis* (: *meis*) 625, (: *Engleis*) 131, 140.

(*b*) Acc. sing. *barun* (: *non*) 743; *seigniur* (: *creatur*) 4.

(*c*) Nom. pl. *ordiné* (: *entré*) 1251; *pasturel* (: *mantel*) 332; also *païsant* 185, *seigniur* 1269, *sergant* 1549, *parent* 379, *barun* 582.

(*d*) Acc. pl. *chiviaus* (: *beaus*) 26; also *ordenez* 659, *sëus* 562 etc.

ii. (*a*) Nom. sing. *li cerfs* 558, 581, 584; *li fous* 1342; *li paens* 140; *li pauteners* 1399; *li seneschals* 1399, 1551; *li sacrestains* 1110; *hom* 181, 586, 717, 1130 etc.; *li reis* 61, 444, 475 etc.; *li marbre* 912; *li gages* 1634.

(*b*) Acc. sing. *le cerf* 580; *creatur* 3; *mund* 15; *ivern* 267; *faucon* 1040; *barun* 483; *conte* 743; *sanc* 142; *home* 180, 1558 etc. etc.

(*c*) Nom. pl. *li chanoine* 1198, 1269 (final *e* elided); *li chien* 567 etc.; *li brachet* 565; *li paen* 802; *li seigniur* 1293.

(*d*) Acc. pl. *chivalers* 395, 489; *seinz* 38; *enfanz* 141 etc.

iii. Add sign of nom. sing. to *fet* and *defet* 707—8, change *les chanoines* to *li chanoine* 1483; omit *s* of *compaignons* and in line 962 change *ses nons* to *sun non*; the change seems authorised by the fact that the adjective is in the nom. pl.

iv. (*a*) Acc. for nom. *peil* (: *veil*) 689; *vent* (: *-ment*) 1038; *compaignon* (: *non*) 420. There is some excuse for this violation of the rule for *peil*; the ending *-eil* is rare in Old French and has been

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. VII, No. 1 (p. 93).

replaced except in *peil* > *poil* while *veil* has early disappeared (it is retained in English). Other words *feeils* < fidelis, *chameils* < camelus have undergone suffix change, cf. Suchier § 65.

(*b*) Acc. pl. for nom. *peres* : *meres* 23.

We may add a few indeclinable nouns: *sëus* (< segusius) 248; *mes* 318; *sens* 248; *cors* 348.

It may be said then that the author is surprisingly accurate in his use of the Old French declension. There are of course numbers of words which might be corrected and to which no reference has been made, they may well be attributed to the scribe; such are *colum*[s] 1040; *li seneschal*[s] 1611; *li cerf*[s] 588 etc. etc. It does not seem plain whether *finement* (: *prent*) 37 is an infraction or not, there is no other instance of a Latin neuter in *-ment* in our text. The forms *ancestres* 22, *prestres* 417[1] as well as *compaingnon* 420 can hardly be considered as incorrect for Agn., the first and the last appear with the single form for both cases already in the Oxford MS. of the *Roland*. There is only one instance (l. 1377) of an infinitive used as a noun in the nominative case in rime and it is without *s*, the same archaism is found in the *Comput* 985, 2791; the scribe has added an *s* in l. 942; for other cases see ll. 413, 618, 715, 1192.

There is little to remark about proper names; none appear in the nominative case in rime except *Editz* (: *diz*) 233. This is one of those poetic licences with names so common in Gaimar. For nouns of the Latin third and fifth declensions it seems impossible to say whether they take an *s* or not. There is little to be said of feminine nouns. In Old French there are few feminine nouns belonging to the class with varying stress. From sóror, sorórem we have nom. *suer*, acc. *serour*, pl. *serours*, but owing to the frequent use of the form *suer* as a nominative of address, *serour* is early lost and a new pl. *suers* even formed. As early as the *Roland suer* (l. 294) in the accusative is found in an *ué* assonanced tirade. Further *serour* is found as a nominative and even with an added *s*. Similarly are treated words denoting persons having a nom. in *-e* and an acc. in *-ain* as *none, nonain*. Our text seems to offer instances of these changes. Thus in l. 223 the rime with *amur* seems to indicate that the form *seur* should be changed to *serur*; it would have the further advantage of correcting the scansion; while in l. 242 the form *serur* is assured by the rime with *ducur* and *ele* may very properly count as one syllable only; cf. § 5 ii (*β*). The form *serur*

[1] Another reading is suggested in § 44 A iii. In Adgar we find *proveire* as nom. (: *aneire*) 10. 36 and as acc. 13. 56.

seems particularly suitable as it is a later form and these lines are in (B). In ll. 1095, 1217, 1229 *suer* (notice the older spelling) is correct, while in l. 1220 the adoption of the form *seror* would enable one to alter the incorrect *porte* (cf. § 55 i) and would bring the accented final syllable *serúr* into what we may assume was its position intended by the poet, viz. the fourth syllable. In l. 371 we have *nonain* as nominative. In our text the oblique case can still be used in a limited sense for the genitive, particularly in such stock expressions as *la Deu ancele* 49, 635; *les seinz Deu* 38; *Deu enemis* 963; *pur Deu amur* 40, 660; also before proper names as *le jur Seint Michel* 1105; and when the genitive expresses a person, *les plaiz l'evesque* 1458, 1470.

There is little to remark as to gender. *Honur* would seem to be feminine but the evidence of the adjective *trespassable* (: *estable*) 17 is unconvincing. *Fiertre* appears both as masculine and feminine 1491, 1495; in the only other case that I have met it in Agn. (*St Richard* 1639) it is masculine; by analogy probably with *châsse* it became and remains feminine.

§ 44. Adjectives.

The adjectives may be treated in the same way as the nouns and divided into (i) such forms of adjectives and past participles as are correct judged by rime and scansion; (ii) such as may be considered correct from scansion and orthography; (iii) such as may be corrected without detriment to scansion or rime; and (iv) such as are proved incorrect by rime or scansion.

A. Masculines.

i. (*a*) Nom. sing. *-ez* < *-atus*, *iz* < *-itus*, *-uz* < *-utus* are assured by the following rimes: *aprestez* (: *entendez*) 29; *passez* (: *guez*) 604; *evaniz* (: *partiz*) 622; *restuz* (: *venuz*) 615; and also in the following: 493, 720, 912, 987, 1351, 1352, 1403, 1404, 1553, 1554, 1621, 1649, 1650.

(*b*) The nom. pl. without flexional *s* is assured by the following rimes: *alé* (: *trespassé*) 31; *lé* (: *mangé*) 491; *avenu* (: *vertu*) 82; *grant* (: *siwant*) 567; *seur* (: *jur*) 864; also the ll. 115, 207, 607, 623, 769, 792, 885, 888, 939, 941, 954, 1010, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1050, 1057, 1083, 1084, 1236, 1340, 1381, 1382, 1484.

ii. (*a*) Nom. sing. *fols* 20; *bons* 37; *gariz* 1635.

(*b*) Nom. pl. *luintain* 187; *lé* 379; *venu* 767; also 956, 1168, 1257, 1484, 1512.

iii. The following could easily be corrected:

bon 2; *fort* 61, 279; *amé* 79; *seint* 138; *lung* 275; *blanc* 558

venu 548, 584; *conissant* 970; *contenu* 1371; *sein* 1534: the lines 417—8 might be emended *Proveire esteient ordiné, E seint evesque puis sacré.*

iv. The following are incorrect according to rime or scansion:

Nom. sing. *puissant* (: *refusant*) 61, 673; *fort* (: *port*) 609; *restif* (: *belif*) 950; and also 100, 963, 983, 1346, 1546 and in (B) *parfund* (: *punt*) 277; *bruiant* (: *despant*) 279.

After a neuter subject, whether expressed or not, the attributive adjective is normally neuter, i.e. without flexional *s*, in Old French, but the feeling for the neuter is too vague for this to be an invariable rule; the masculine is often found (cf. Brunot, *Grammaire historique*, I, p. 223 C). The neuter seems to be preferred in Agn., e.g. *Pestiaire*: *E cuvenable esteit* 71 etc.; Gaimar:...*pur ço est dit* (: *murdrit*) 4053; *ço est dreit* (: *esteit*) 5112 etc.; Adgar: *ceo n'est dreit* (: *toleit*) 8. 133; *St Gilles*: *il es dreit* 2091. The examples for our text are in lines 58, 851 (cf. § 59), 1369.

B. Feminines.

Taking the feminine adjectives and participles in the same order there are few infractions of the ordinary rules of declension.

i. The adjectives in *-abilis* are correctly *trespassable* : *estable* 17; *grant* (: *tant*) 536; : *aparissant* 819; other lines showing correct forms are: 69, 73, 127, 170, 362, 363, 367, 368, 387, 421, 439, 443, 462, 797, 810, 826, 1117, 1167, 1215, 1262, 1375, 1389, 1411, 1651.

ii. The existence of forms as *grant* is assured by scansion in ll. 138, 806, 1063 and *lasse* by ll. 1166, 1224.

iii. Changes could be made without detriment to the text in: *granz* 16, *mené* 377; also in ll. 464—5, 651, 829, 1106, 1167.

iv. Except for *tele* (already common in the twelfth century) all the infractions are found in (B), e.g. *repairé* 231; *remansu* 268; *irascu* 312.

§ 45. Agreement of the past participle.

The rule for the agreement of the past participle when the object precedes is observed in the following cases assured by the rime: 444, 481, 678, 809, 1118, 1201, 1202, 1222 and with the object following in line 421. (This may be *because* of the rime.)

The rule is broken in the following cases in rime: 148, 688, 1513, 1514, 1516 and in (B) 285, 288. Lines 200 *apris*[*e*] and 719 *fet*[*e*] could be so emended.

The non-observance is sometimes convenient especially in (B) and (A) as rimes otherwise impossible are thereby secured, e.g. 1513—4. This is common in thirteenth century Agn. poems, cf. *St Richard* § 50.

§ 46. The past participle with reflexive verbs.

Only one case of agreement of the participle with the subject in the masculine seems to occur in rime: *s'est partiz* 621; but there are a large number of feminines, e.g. 269, 302, 409, 440, 709, 829, 1133, 1136, 1258. There are other cases correct in the interior of the line, e.g. 617, while many others could be emended by the simple addition of [*z*]; e.g. 496, 570, 978, 1359; one case only of non-agreement seems assured by the rime, viz. 1325.

§ 47. Adjective.

A. Possessive (possessive pronouns are also included).

The ordinary weak forms are all found and the following alone are noteworthy: *si* (nom. pl.) 1529; *le men* 982; *le mien* 437; *la sue* 505; *un lur* 1321; *les seens* 1542.

B. Demonstrative and indefinite.

Our text has nom. sing. *cil* 140, 512 and *cist* 1441 side by side with *icest* 1160 and *cest* 1090. The correct forms are doubtless those of the poet but none of them appear in rime. *Cist* is found in line 582 as nom. pl.; the acc. pl. is *ces*; we may notice also *cil autre* as nom. pl. 930; *itel* and *tel* as feminines 928, 1024, and the use of the definite article with these adjectives as *des ces* 763. For the indefinite we note *aukes de*...231, 448 etc.

§ 48. Pronouns—personal and reflexive.

The strong-accented forms of the personal pronoun are found:

i. After prepositions: *par mei* 244; *pur li* (masc.) 58; *a ly* 497; *a li* (fem.) 244; *pur lui* (fem.) 196; *ou li* (fem.) in rime with *ci* 806; also ll. 670, 1165, 997, 149.

ii. Before an infinitive: *sei fere* 965, also 530, 534, 641, 1168; further after an infinitive: *pur prendre sei* 721.

iii. After an indicative: *purpense sei* 721; also the weak form: *e traveillent se* which should perhaps be emended to *sei* 1193. (Cf. *Bestiaire: Deus la furmat e concut lui* 3105.)

iv. After a past part. and before a finite: *E estrussé li ad*...1111.

v. As a disjunctive: *li = elle*, cf. ll. 282, 361, 636, 800.

vi. With reflexive verbs instead of *sei* as *de li mover* 1070.

It is doubtful whether this form may be used before a finite verb. The Agn. MS. of *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* 991 has *e li turna vers Orient* but this may be an incorrect reading, although it turns accurately the Latin: *ad Orientem conversa*; the continental versions have *ele garda* or *esgarda*.

The pronoun *ele* has often the syllabic value of *el'*, e.g. 312, 319, 1246 and is sometimes so written, but oftener not.

All the weak forms are found, *li* seems to be the usual form for both masculine and feminine; *lui* only appears once, line 196. The pronoun *en* appears in its modern use in line 387 and also in its Old French sense of 'in the matter,' e.g. 714, 998. In line 272 *u* = *à laquelle* and in line 694 *i* = *li* (cf. Brunot, *Grammaire historique*, I, p. 226, *Bestiaire*: *Quant diable at tempté Saint ume e espruvé Ne mal n'i pot truver*, 1167—9 Jordan Fautosme: *Fors la cité de Lund' s, u nul ne set sa per*, *Chronique* 912 and *Modwenna*: *A tele vus cumanderai, U jeo tres bien m'afierai* 527—8). The *i* of *li* is elided in line 286 (B), cf. *St Richard* § 52.

The syntax of the pronoun in our poem is no longer that of the oldest texts; whereas any of the pronouns may be omitted as subjects, all may be used. There is probably a slight difference, thus in ll. 1143, 1145, 1146 there is some stress implied by the sense which is quite absent in ll. 1147, 1149, 1150. Instances of omission are very numerous, e.g. ll. 660, 757—60, 917, 1004, 1100, 1141, 1175; instances of use 661—2, 968, 1327 etc. There is a good instance of a strong use of *il* in line 686 and of *il* as disjunctive in 493.

There are two cases which may be discussed separately. In ll. 698 and 1108 we find the weak forms of the pronoun used after an infinitive and the infinitives are complemental depending on a preposition. The common usage here is to employ the strong form which should precede the infinitive. In the first of these two cases the pronoun is perhaps spurious, the line has a syllable too many and that in a portion of the poem where the scansion is on the whole accurate; it may have been introduced from the following line; further the MS. has a sign ? which is employed elsewhere to indicate a pause in the sense, e.g. l. 752 after *servir*. We propose to emend by omitting the *la*. In the second case the position may be due to the desire of the poet to avoid hiatus of the final *e* of *faire* with initial *i* of *iluec*. To explain the use of the weak form the poet may have had in mind another construction, viz. the use of the weak form with a finite verb having an infinitive complement; this form would, and generally did even till the seventeenth century, precede the finite verb but it might immediately precede the infinitive; thus in the *Bestiaire* in two consecutive lines we have an example of each construction: *Nel volent esculter, Volent le desturber* 1715—6.

The use of the pronoun after the infinitive is a peculiarity of N.W. texts. According to Rydberg, *o.c.* pp. 587—95, it is confined to those

districts that to-day form the départements of Eure, Seine inférieure, Calvados, Manche and Seine et Oise, i.e. nearly all Normandy and a part of Ile de France. It is natural therefore to find cases in Anglo-French works. Rydberg quotes a large number of instances but in most of these the strong form of the pronoun is preferred.

The use of the weak form of the pronoun after a finite verb seems to be rare; I can only find in my notes two instances, viz. *Tristan* of Béroul *laidissent la* 775; and *Roman de Troie*: *Honora les de grant maniere*, 1204.

§ 48 *a*. The pronoun with reflexive verbs.

Whereas in Old French the number of reflexive verbs was greatly increased by the inclusion of verbs that were intransitive in Latin, there was a tendency to omit the reflexive pronoun and to render the verb intransitive; this was specially the case with the present participle and the infinitive. Numerous examples are quoted by Brunot, *op. cit.* p. 237; our text offers examples in ll. 939, 1425—7. The verb which seems to have most easily dispensed with the pronoun is *se lever*; our poem offers the following instances: *Bien leva devant* (corr. *ainz*?) *le chant de gal* 306; *Et par matin est tost levé* 1359; *E cele est par matin levée* 1411. Examples are very numerous; thus: *Bestiaire* : *Kar se culchiez esteit* (the elephant) *Par sei ne levereit* 1545—6. Examples do not seem very plentiful in Gaimar[1] or Adgar[2] but *St Gilles* contains many, e.g. *Par la cité leve le cri* 753; *le soleil leve* 916, also 2739, 1379, but *Il s'en levat* 622. *Sainte Marie* has similar cases and so too Marie de France: *Li chevaliers cuntre els leva* (*Guigemar* 769 and *ibidem* 673, 869 and *Deuz Amanz* 214), also *Haveloc* 708 *Le cri lieve en la cité*; *ibid.* 903 *Haveloc est levé en piez.* In the *Roland* we find *Isnelement sur lor piez releverent* 3575 and Crestien de Troyes, *Erec: Quant a lor eise orent sopé Et des tables furent levé*...501—2. There is a full discussion of this phenomenon as far as the seventeenth century is concerned in §§ 60—61 of Haase, *Syntaxe française du xvii*[e] *siècle.*

§ 49. Pronouns—relative and interrogative.

The scribe prefers the spellings with initial *k*; we have many instances of *ki* or *ky*, e.g. 2, 39, 101 etc. but very frequently *ke* stands for the nominative; this form must often be due to the poet since this

[1] I remember no case with *lever* but we find *Quand il turnad de la cuntrée* (cf. ll. 3675, 4013), compare with *Cil s'en turnad* 4513 (cf. 4237).

[2] I can only recall *Establi a sei itel us Que chaune nuit leva sus, Si ala puis en cel mustier* 18. 31—3.

e is elided with the following vowel, e.g. 1317, 1375 (not elided 1092); *ki* may stand for older *cui* 112, 830. The poet uses the relative *que* in the feminine 805 but this may be only a spelling and of no importance. The neuter is *ke* 1141 and also *kei* 312, 319. Note too *ceo que* 406 referring to a phrase.

§ 50. Pronoun—demonstrative.

The forms are fairly correct: nom. sing. *cil* 9, 12, 453, 1171; incorrect *cel* 237 (B); nom. pl. *cil* 1043, 1047, 1123, 1455; acc. pl. *ceus* 21; fem. *cele* 1177. The poet is fond of the longer form *icest* which is twice in rime 544, 730. We have also *cesti* as acc. 626 and *ceo* is common; for the compound demonstrative we have *ly qui* 569.

§ 51. Pronoun—indefinite.

The following forms occur: *l'em* 94, 164; *l'en* 372; *l'un* 955 but regularly (cf. § 42) *li un...li autre* 542; *les autres* 919; *chescun* (never with *s*) 926 etc., with verb in pl. 1028; *aucun* 1173; *plusurs* 187 as nom. pl. in (B) but not assured; for Latin totus the forms vary but the nom. pl. *tuit* is in rime with *bruit* 999; *amdeuz* and *amedeuz* occur in (B) 288, 341; *tele* 55 assured by scansion; *mult de* 1299 and *aukes de* are common.

§ 52. Adverbs.

The adverbs are well represented in our text: *petit* 165 together with *poi* 18; *aval* and *amunt* 869; *sus e jus* 624; *guerres* 67 and *gueres* in the sense of nothing 680; *leus* 323 (a form also found in the Corpus MS. of *Sainte Marie*); *meuz* (= plutôt) 1365; *a plein* (cf. § 14) and the Agn. form *sovente feiz* (cf. § 59). As adverbial complement we may note *mot ne sona* 903. An interesting word is *enteins* (cf. § 59). The adverbs in *-ment* are mostly in the older and correct forms as: *comunaument* 804; *cruelment* 796, 807, 986; *delivrement* 556; *erranment* 986; *estrussement* 499 (this adverb is derived from *estrossé* and should therefore be *estrosséement*, such seems to be the form in *Erec* 5592); *forment* 507; *leaument* (not *lelment* as often in Agn.) 835. *Dreit* and *tut dreit* are found but not abusively as is often the case in Agn. (cf. *St Richard* § 57); *tut* and *trestut* are common 558, 658, 606 and so too are *a tut* 780 and *del tut* 829, 864. Note too *aukes* 887.

§ 53. Conjunction.

The question of the conjunction in our poem is almost exclusively the syntax of *que* as few compound conjunctions are to be found in it;

si is still used though sparingly for *et*, e.g. 119[1], 527 and also *ne* 168 but *si* is already for *if* at least for the scribe. The syntax of *que* is one of the most interesting chapters of Old French grammar[2]; we shall endeavour to sum it up as concisely as possible, adding too the examples where no *que* appears.

I. With verbs denoting intellectual activity.

i. knowing, believing.

A. With the indicative in the dependent clause.

Sachez ke la pucele...*esteit* bele 169; cf. 1663.

Purpensa sey...ke rien ne *valut* sa dolur 721; cf. 895, 897.

With infinitive: *Cuida* son livre *aver receu* 287 (B).

No *que*: Tres bien *savez*, Vers Dampnedeu mespris *avez* 1561.

Quide (ke) deable l'en *a* traï 696.

B. With the subjunctive.

Sin *crei*...ke seinte Osith gré le *sauvast* 119—20 (cf. § 59).

Lors ke *neée fust suscherent* 239.

Ke *conisant seit*...ke...ne *seum*...perilié 970—2.

ii. perceiving.

A. Quant la dame *entent* Ke ne *volent* faire nient 663—4, also 1279.

Quant cil *veient* ke n'*ad* mestier 951, also 723, 1602.

Bien...*ad aparceu* K'ele *fu* dolente 311.

No *que*: Kant *veit* ne *puet* estre muée 723, also 1588.

B. *Entendez*...ke en *puissez* aver aïe 123.

S'il *veit* ke el estre ne *peust* 727.

iii. declaring.

A. *Dirrez* (ke) granz biens i *puet* trover 245, also 250, 304, 631, 1418.

E...*voé unt* Ke chescun *ferunt* porter 1027.

Il *resona* ke a lui se *vout*...468, also 469.

No *que*: Bien l'*os* dire, fols *est* pur veir 20, also 499—500, 515, 703, 707.

Ceo signe (ke) de joie *volent* trere 1496.

B. Ke dunc *fust* nonein ne *di* pas 371.

Unk cele nef *ne fist samblant* k'en ewe *fust*...921.

iv. Impersonal verbs.

A. Un jour *aveneit*...que Modwen *aleit* 825.

[1] 119. In this line the *si en* of the MS. is to be read *sin*.

[2] We shall follow throughout the able statement of its importance as contained in Mr Ritchie's *Recherches sur la syntaxe de la conjonction 'que' dans l'ancien français*, Paris 1907.

Acune feiz *avint*...ke grant tempeste *out*...859.

Ke *deit* ke nostre nef ne *vait*? 934, cf. § 59.

B. When the principal clause is negative or hypothetical the mood is the subjunctive; there are no cases of this in our text.

II. With verbs denoting emotion.

A. Old and Middle French prefer the indicative mood and we find: Molt *se merveille* que ge *puis* tant targier (*Cour. de Louis* 1108) and Je *regrette* de tout mon cueur que n'*est* icy Picrochole (Rabelais). Anglo-Norman, however, seems to prefer the subjunctive though some instances of the indicative are to be found, e.g. *C'est merveille* ke jo m'en *tais* (*St Gilles* 116), also *ibidem* 245, 2877 and *Ce peise* mei ke jo *sui* vive (*Ste Marie* 414). Our text offers no instances of the indicative.

B. Edith *s'est emerveilliée* Ke *fëist* Osith tant targer 302.

Li chanoine s'*en vunt plaindre* a Deu...Ke *seit* eus vengant 1483.

Pur *estre grevé* Ke de havene *seient* jeté 939.

N'*estut doter* Quel jur *deive* del siecle aler 35.

III. With verbs denoting volition.

i. will, command, prayer, obligation.

A. The only case of the indicative is one in which no *que* occurs.

Tant *a requis*...Le dreit chemin li *unt* mustré 1188.

B. Jeo *voil* ke le veil me *donez* 645.

A seinte Osith *a graanté* Ke *remaine* tut autresi 723, also 1294.

Suffrir ne vout K'ele *seit* al mustier 1112, also 1505.

Deu *a purvueu* issi Ke guerisun *eies* 1153.

Comandent...K'il *augent* tut a avirons 935.

Covient...Deu *prier* K'il nus *pardoint* icel pechié 1008.

Covent ke jeo *meste* mun don 736.

So also with *demander* 1184; *orer* 120; *crier* 1127, 1232; *reclamer* 584; *requerre* 176, 403, 659, 1143, 1296, 1386, 1620; *conseillier* 208 and less usual phrases as *crier merci ke*...471; *metre en preres ke* 341—4; *prendre penitance ke*...966; *estre en aïe ke*...1685.

No *que*: Deu unt *requis*...Mes ne *seient* en tel baillie 1024, also 403—7.

ii. preventing, forbidding.

1. Requert Deu li *purgart*...ke ne *perde* 407.
2. *Metrai mon poer* Ke ne *seie*...hunie 437.
3. A seinte Osith ne *puet hom mesfaire* K'ele n'*enprenge* 1571.
4. Comanda aler...pur *veer* Ke a Chic [ne] *deusent* poseer 1453.

The use of *ne* seems absolute and as it occurs in exs. 1, 2, 3 I add it in 4 also.

The indicative is sometimes found when a resolution is expressed: Puis ceste hure *mettrai*...*Tute ma force*...ke mes travail n'*avrez* ll. 531—3.

IV. The co-relative.

The use of the co-relative is not frequent in our text; *ço* is by far the commonest: *Ceo* demander serreit folie 322; Mes tut seez *de ceo* seur ke...1664, or adverbial expressions as L'alme del cors *pur poi* n'en ist 691.

V. *Que* consecutive: *que* = *si bien que.*

A. Et par les gerrons...*prist* Son mantel ke le livre *obli* 282—4.

Et *travaillient* sei...ke *venu i sunt* 1193

and with the expressions *si ke, si cum, tel ke, tant ke...*

La contraite...plure *si ke* noiant *esteit* escuter 1242.

Ele prend *tel* vengement *ke*...bien *parra*...1573.

Tant veit *k'*al muster *est* venue 810, also 1213, 1224, 1326.

No *que*: Seinte Osith l'a *si* forment mis...Ne *puet*...plus estre ostez 1347—51.

If the result is positive, the verb is in the indicative.

VI. *Que* final. (The verb is always in the subjunctive.)

Modwen a Edith Osith *enveia* Ke bien la *preist*...227.

Le liu Nonnepol *est apellé* Ke ja mes en siecle ne *seit* celé 370, also 363.

The so-called optative use can be included here; with and without *que.*

Amis *ke* Deu vus *doint* sauveté 327.

Seinte Osith nus *seit* en aïe...1685.

Deu *penst* de mei par sa merci 666.

VII. *Que* causal.

i. que = weakened *car.*

Ke Deu ama e Deu servi 57. This use is uncommon in our text and in the example here quoted Ke might conceivably = *qui.*

ii. *que* = puisque.

Only in the phrase *quant est issi* where *quant* replaces *que* 665, 729, cf. § 59.

iii. *que* with interjections (the ordinary tense is the pres. indic.).

Allas, ke il ne *set* icest 544.

Ha Deus ke Edith ne *seust* l'aventure. (This is possibly corrupt and should read: *Deus*! k'Edith ne *sot*...but the subjunctive might stand though it is very rare[1], for the scansion in that case see § 5 ii (ζ).)

[1] Mr Ritchie *l.c.* p. 74 quotes only two cases of the past subjunctive and very few of the past indicative.

VIII. *Que* temporal.

i. With expressions of time (*que* is here often replaced by *quant*).

En icel tens ke cil veneient 1459.

Le jur ke seinte Osith alat, *Kant* li reys...renmenat 411—2.

*Meïsme l'houre k'*est venuz 1623.

E *gueres plus ne demora, K'*il autre feiz la resona 468.

Seinte Osith a *ceste houre* en pris *Ke* sur son chief...677.

L'*ure quant* sunt li chien passé 607.

ii. With compound conjunctions expressing:

(α) simultaneous action:

*Dementers k'*en ceste vie fu 195.

*A ceo k'*esteient haut chantant 1199 (cf. § 59).

(β) posterior action:

A ceo ke il ad parlé ci 1591 (cf. § 59).

A peine out Modwen sa voiz fini *Ke* de l'ewe Osith ne issi 351.

(For a discussion of this phrase, see § 59.)

Dekes a Deu s'est si rendue 709.

No *que*: *Hui est le quart jur* trespassant, Puis n'en oi mes...317.

(γ) anterior action:

De ci ke vint al vendredi 1540.

Si cum (= aussitôt) Edith *aveit veu* 309.

IX. *Que* comparative.

Bons fu ki...aime son creatur *Plus ke ne* fet autri 4.

Kant sa dolur a fet *assez Ke* tut put estre alessez 719—20.

Mes *plus* semblant *ne* fist la nef *Ke* maison fet le cuchetref 945[1].

Si l'aturne *a meuz ke* poeit 1099, also 1131.

Meux le vus voil dire...*K'*autre le vus die[2]...1365.

X. *Que* concessive.

As above with temporal clauses *quant* competes with *que*, so in causal, final and concessive clauses *cume* or *cum* is often found; this is the case in the only example in our text:

Ne sai cument...*Fors cum* Deu le vout...1049.

It would seem here, however, that *cum* or *que* should be omitted, cf. § 70.

[1] Cf. § 59.

[2] Note that this *que* stands for *que que*, English *than that*. This use was retained in Old French long after it had become impossible to omit *que*. Grammarians suggest that this should be avoided by using *que si* as: Il vaut mieux que l'innocent périsse que si toute la nation allait se révolter contre César (Massillon). What I believe to be the oldest instance of this is in the continental version of *Sainte Marie*: *Por ce est il plus avenant Que tu le doinses or a moi Que se je le donasse a toi*, cf. Ritchie *o.c.* p. 93.

§ 54. The conjunction, contd.

The value of the conjunction for determining the date of a literary work has been suitably foreshadowed by Mr Ritchie in the work mentioned in the foregoing section. The matter is bound to receive henceforth the closest attention of philologists. It is an additional test to be applied[1]. Unfortunately linguistic tests applied to French works produced in England are always somewhat unsatisfactory, since they may be at once more archaic and more modern than continental French works of like date. We remarked in § 17 that some knowledge of an author's upbringing is necessary and this often has to be arrived at by long and not always incontrovertible methods. Thus the *Vie de saint Gilles*, judged from the linguistic point of view, is perhaps as old as 1150 while certain matters of fact referred to in it place it certainly some quarter of a century later. Applying the test of the conjunction to our poem, we find that no violation of twelfth century syntax occurs in the main body of the work; it is only in (B) that we find *a peine... que* which, as is stated in § 59, I have not met with outside fourteenth century texts.

§ 55. Conjugation.

I. Persons:

The first person singular takes neither *e* nor *s* when these are not authorised by the etymology as is proved by the following rimes or scansion: *comant* (: *puissant*) 674; *cri* (: *ici*) 640, 1119; *jur* (: *seur*) 863, also *aim* 1287; *os* 20; *vei* (: *dei*, cf. § 31) 1602; *crei* (: *rei*) 253; *di* (: *oï*) 1657, (: *si*) 1636; *rent* (: *finablement*) 1292, also *promet* 527; *quer* 1122; *enquer* 994. The form *porte* 1220 is probably due to the scribe and the line should be emended as suggested in § 43; yet forms with *e* occur as early as *Brandan* (circ. 1120—5) while *doins* 737 is already in the *Roland* and the *Couronnement de Louis*.

The first plural ending is only once written *-ums* 961, otherwise it is *-um* but of course *sumes* 956; the ending *-um* is many times in the rime but always with itself, e.g. 1005, 1435 etc., 337 (B). The third plural has occasionally *-unt* (cf. § 5 iv), e.g. 28, 759 etc.

II. Infinitive:

The verbs of the first conjugation are never confused with those of the third as *saver* : *demorer* in *Beuve de Haumtone* 898 except *saver* : *targer* 304 in (B), cf. § 15. This phenomenon is common by the middle

[1] Thus Mr Ritchie applying this test to the *Pèlerinage*, considered by many to be an eleventh or very early twelfth century text, doubted that it should be ascribed to a date earlier than the end of the twelfth century, while M. Coulet (*Études sur le Voyage de Charlemagne*, Montpellier 1907) arrived at a like conclusion from other considerations.

of the thirteenth century and there are some cases in the rimed sermon *Deu le omnipotent*, e.g. *penser* : *aver* (altogether five cases in 122 sixains), but in certain texts as *St Richard* (circ. 1270) the confusion is limited to the commonest verbs as: *aver, saver, ver, poer, valer.* There are no instances of this in Gaimar, Adgar or *St Gilles.* The form *obli* (: *chai*) 283 suggests an infinitive *oblir*; such barbarisms are frequent in late thirteenth century Anglo-French.

III. Present:

The third person singular of *aler* is *vait* in rime with *trait* 669 and also *dreit* 899, cf. § 13; the third plural of *dire* is *dient* 927. In the subjunctive the verbs of the first conjugation have no *e* in the third person, e.g. *penst* 627; *purgart* (: *tart*) 407; *pardoint* 327 etc.; *aït* 1590. Other forms are *augent* 936; *donez* (i.e. *doniez*) : *targiez* 645. The third sing. of *saveir* is *sace* but not in rime. This is the normal form for Anglo-Norman; it is in rime with *grace* in the *Bestiaire*, in *St Laurent*, *Tristan* and Adgar and with *place* in *Ipomedon* 2297; from *prendre* we have *prenge* 1573, already in the *Bestiaire* 20 and *Donnei des Amanz* 74.

IV. Imperfect:

The imperfect ending *-out* of the first conjugation is only once *-finout*[1] (: *plout*) 212 found in rime contrary to the practice of most Agn. writers; the ending *-eit* which is often added to verbs of the first conjugation is here found only in three instances: two in (B) 201, 225 and one in (A) 1438. From *estre* we find *ert* 267 and *estoie* 987.

V. Preterite:

For *t* of the weak forms cf. § 31. The preterite of *chaïr* is *chaï* and of *remaindre remist*; this form is already in the *Bestiaire* but here only in (B); that of *voleir* is *vout* 453 and *vot* 237. The first sing. of *saveir* is *soi* 320. There are no 'dedi' perfects; thus the preterite of *tendre* is *tendi.* The form *fu* is alone used both before vowels and consonants.

VI. Future and conditional:

From *doner* we have *durra* 500 and *dureient* 1474; from *laissier* (*laier*) *larrum* 299; from *estre ert* 29; further *plereit* 242; *parra* 1574; the shortened forms of *faire*, e.g. *frai*, are common in Agn. since the *Bestiaire* and so too the trisyllabic forms *avera* etc.; these last are, however, always dissyllabic according to the scansion.

VII. Imperative:

The only form of interest is *diez* 328.

[1] This form even is not quite certain; the correct reading might be *fin out*; the tenses would then be in better agreement.

§ 56. The government of verbs.

Very little attention has been paid to the government of verbs in Old French in the standard grammars; I am therefore contenting myself with a simple constatation of facts as they are in this poem.

aidier vers 121, 126; here the prepositional complement seems rather to belong to *avancer* or *amendement.*

apendre de 754; usually with *a* or *envers*, e.g.

Deus ne fist terre qui envers *li n'apende*;

Il i (= *lui*) *apent Baviere et Alemaigne. Cour. de Louis* ll. 16—7.

comander (or *mander*, cf. § 59) followed by infinitive without preposition 577, 1244, 1451.

comencer without preposition 498, 275, 697, 777, 834. Cf. Burghardt, *Über den Einfluss des Englischen auf das Anglonormannische*, where many examples are quoted with *a, de* or no preposition; cf. too *St Richard* § 67.

donner vers 1693: no instance in Godefroy. Cf. *La Folie Tristan* (MS. Oxford) 323.

entendre vers 1556, generally with *a*, cf. l. 87; no instance in Godefroy.

mesfaire a 1572; the usual construction is with *vers*; Godefroy v 282.

mesprendre vers 1562; one instance in Godefroy viii 203 b; in the *Donnei des Amanz* 74 with *devers.*

oïr de with infinitive 429 and with *entour* 89; no instances in Godefroy.

se peiner de 429, 618; the examples in Godefroy are of much later date than our poem.

servir a 8, 759. This would appear to be a latinism, though classical Latin uses the dative or *apud*; I have only met this construction in religious and didactic work (cf. Koschwitz, *Commentar* p. 90, § 4). The same construction occurs in *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* l. 8[1]. Godefroy x 669 b quotes this use in a somewhat different sense.

tucher de 201, 1436. No examples in Godefroy of this use till modern times.

§ 57. Periphrastic constructions.

Our text contains many such constructions:

i. *aler* + present participle 1374, 1501, 1516, 1530, 1535, 1543.
ii. *estre* + „ „ 317, 474, 889, 1488, 1637, 1641, 1642.
iii. *venir* + „ „ 63—4, 1491.

[1] Further *Vie de saint André*, l. 397, *Et s'a mon Deu ne vus servir* in MSS. Paris, Arsenal 3516 and Oxford Canon. Misc. 74.

The reading *l'ad tut refusant* l. 62 should perhaps be *li va....* Instances of these constructions may be seen in plenty in mono-rimed tirades of *Renaut de Montauban.*

§ 58. *Voleir* with the infinitive.

This construction with a future sense has been called an anglicism by Burghardt, *l. c.* pp. 57—74. Without a fuller examination of continental didactic work I am not inclined to accept this view, but the frequency of the construction in Agn. is striking; since, however, the main output of Agn. literature is religious, the source should perhaps be looked for rather in late Latin didactic literature. Our text presents: *voil* + infinitive in ll. 65, 648, 742, 981, 982, 1364; *volum* + infinitive in line 1004; *voudrai* in line 642 and *voudrunt* line 1673.

§ 59. Words and phrases.

se aveir 1437. G. quotes this in the sense of 'se conduire'; its meaning here is rather the Latin one.

barun = husband 483, cf. *Panuce,* published by me in *Romania* XXXVIII p. 421.

brache = braquet 562. Godefroy only quotes *brachet,* cf. l. 565. Cf. *Bestiaire* of Guillaume le Clerc 224.

cheminal; see footnote to line 307.

chescum 190; Agn. scribes adhere carefully to the form *chescun* or *chascun* but in its adjectival use it is often found as e.g. *en chascun endreit*—a group of four syllables—where the scansion seems to demand *chaque,* a form of only rare occurrence in the thirteenth century (cf. Brunot, *Grammaire,* ii 320).

comander and *mander* 577, 1244, 1451; the confusion of these two verbs seems to be complete.

cuchetref 946. This word does not to my knowledge occur elsewhere; I believe it is the sail that was used as an awning and known in *St Gilles* as *tialz* (see below *teoldé*). Professor Brandin has kindly suggested to me that the line may perhaps have read *K'en maison fet le archetref*; I have not found *archetref* nor indeed *architrave* earlier than the sixteenth century. In favour of *cuchetref* may be cited several meanings of *couch* in the N.E.D. Professor Weekley suggests to read *Ke maison fet ne* (for *le*) *cuchetref.*

deit 934; see footnote to line, cf. § 53 iv A.

despire 166. This verb seems to be exclusively Norman and Agn.

empaourir 692. This would seem to be a variant of *espaourir,* cf.

Pèlerinage 709 where the MS. has *aspourie*; *espoörie* is also in *St Auban* l. 486 and *Vie de St Grégoire* by Angier, 1934.

enfundré 296. Godefroy quotes *enfonder* and variant *enfondrer*. The line should perhaps be corrected *enfondrés*; cf. § 65.

enteims 157, 939, 1479; according to G. Paris, Introduction to *St Gilles* p. xvii this word is not often found after the twelfth century. It occurs in the *Donnei* l. 375.

entrussément 499, *estrusser* 1111. The adverb and the phrase *a estros* are very common, but the verb does not appear in Godefroy in the sense it has here of 'to drive out.'

envilir 1517. Godefroy does not quote this form but only *aviler* and *enviler* in the meaning here implied. (For *en-* for *a-* see § 6.)

esquieler 1322 quoted by G. under *escueillier* = scutellarius, a scullery man. I am indebted to Professor Suchier for this hint.

esperital 308 = inspiration, only as an adjective in G.

frankeleins 490. G. does not quote this word; its meaning is evidently a small freeholder.

fanfelue 1318 = modern French *fanfreluche*.

gerrons 282 = the flaps of the cloak.

glu 1331, cf. Godefroy, Supplément.

gré = willingly 119. G. mentions this use but quotes no examples; I have met no other instance; the line should be emended as in § 53 I B.

krenke 290, apparently an English word such as Agn. writers often introduce into their works, e.g. *D'ales en engleis dist hom Ely*[1] (*Vie de Sainte Audrée*, folio 102 v° b).

menestraus 1444 = servants; in this sense its use seems to be confined to didactic literature, e.g. Alexis 65 d; Chardry, *Sept Dormanz* 766.

merir 1674 = reward; cf. G. v 259 a and the late Latin distinction between *mereo* and *mereor*.

ostez 574. Godefroy quotes *ostes* s.v.; 'exclamation employée pour repousser l'idée d'une chose'; it occurs very frequently according to him in the *Roman du saint Graal*. If this form is correct, it is interesting to consider it as an imperative forming an interjection and to compare it with the English *out!* which may possibly be formed on the same model.

overaine 1344 appears to be workwoman whereas *uveraine* 1298 seems to have the meaning of work to be done about a place.

oveskaus 1452, 1474 = ecclesiastics; G. only quotes as adjective.

[1] This is translated directly from Bede, cap. XVII (XIX), ed. Plummer, p. 246 *Unde et a copia anguillarum...nomen accepit.*

seüz 562 = hunting dogs
suchier 339 < suspicari } . G. Paris, Introduction to *St Gilles* p. xviii, remarks that these two words seem not to be found after the twelfth century.

soil 1476. In the sense this word bears here, G. quotes no clear instances (cf. § 20). There is another instance in Sanson de Nantuil (apud Bartsch, *Lang. et Litt.* col. 152. 35).

taches 281 = the fastening of the cloak, i.e. *fibula*, as found in the glossary mentioned in *Documents manuscrits* (P. Meyer) p. 126 and published in the *Jahrbuch für rom. u. eng. Literatur* vii 37—8.

teoldé 874. The verb *teolder* is unknown elsewhere; as stated in the footnote, the word refers to the raising of the awning (*tialz*) over the waist of a ship when in port, its object was to increase the accommodation. Boats with tilts—tilt-boats—were in use on the Thames in the last century. In line 874 *bien* should be omitted.

veage 375 appears to have the meaning 'phase'; in this sense it is not quoted by Godefroy.

volage 239 = a frivolous person; not quoted by G. in this sense till 1386. Chardry has the word with the meaning frivolity: *Car jeo sai ke par volage, Estes entrez en tele rage. Sept Dormanz* 431—2.

a ceo que 1199, 1591. As will have been seen from § 53 viii, this conjunction is used to imply both simultaneous action with and posterior action to that of the principal verb. In the first sense its use is older than in the second and it should be noted that the first occurs in the older portion (O) and the second in (A). Mr Ritchie only found *en iceo que* in the twelfth century works he examined.

a merveille 215. This is an early use of the locution; generally one finds in Old French *merveilles* in this sense; this occurs in the same MS. in the life of St Audry, folio 117 v° a. Early instances of *a merveille* and *a merveilles* are to be found in *Roman de Troie* 1175, *Guillaume de Palerne* 36, and the *Lai de l'Ombre* 557, but *merveilles* is found as late as the Agn. life of Edward the Confessor (1256) l. 638.

a peine...que...ne 351. This seems to be the oldest case of this conjunction in the sense of scarcely...when... I have not found it before Froissart: *A paines estoient Flamenc cheü, quant pillart venoient...* and *Chevalier du papegai: il n'ot mie a peine finie sa parole, quant il vit venir ung chevalier* (quoted from Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, iv, p. 40). Notice that in each case *que* is replaced by *quant*. The cases of *a paine que* quoted by Mr Ritchie, p. 27, as e.g. *Cant je tres bien i pens, a paine ke n'en plor*; *Poème moral* 337 b, are not temporal conjunctions.

aveir cher 415 = *aimer.*

aveir en pris 677 = to delight in.

curant sur ventre 612, cf. *courir ventre à terre.*

n'i en ad 730, cf. modern *il n'en est rien.*

est a venir 261 = *devenir.* This is perhaps an anglicism, cf. *St Richard* § 71, e.g. *sui a venir* = *je dois venir.* Note this instance is in (B).

fere son bon 508, 513 = *faire son talent.*

fort serreit 851 (cf. § 44 A) = it would be difficult to... There are analogous cases in G., cf. *Forz serreit...*

quant est issi 665 = since it is so.

qui d'un qui d'el 1466 = what with one thing and another.

saver moun 554 = to learn the truth about; cf. *Romania* 1909, p. 420, l. 4.

semblant, voir semblant 1378 = they see no reason for asking; G. does not quote any example of this use.

souventefeiz 481, cf. *St Richard* § 57.

tantes feiz 523, cf. *St Richard* § 57 ; no example in Godefroy.

tel hore est = often, cf. G. under *eure,* iii 672.

tut dis 1415, 1653; this phrase is common in Agn. (less frequent elsewhere); cf. *Bestiaire* 2696; Marie de France, *Bisclavet* 318.

Versification.

§ 60. Divisions of the poem.

Certain reasons for stating that our poem as here published is the work of different periods have been set out in the Introduction; this diversity of authorship is rendered much more evident by an analysis of the versification. The oldest part may be designated as (O); the portion dealing with the punishment of Archbishop Richard as (A); and the Modwenna incident as (B).

The approximate division of the 1694 lines (three have been omitted by the scribe) is as follows:

(O) ll. 1—182, 387—1416 = 1212 (2 ll. omitted in this section),
(A) ll. 1417—1694 = 278 (1 line omitted),
(B) ll. 183—386 = 204.

The length of section (B) must necessarily be somewhat conjectural; ll. 182 and 382 seem by their similarity to suggest the limits of the interpolation, while a few lines before and after these would seem to

form the 'join.' Doubtless the matter of ll. 376—386 was in the original form of the poem as it is in both the Latin MSS. that are of importance—Bodley and Lansdown; the French lines are as close a translation as is generally the case in work of this kind. Another factor which weighed with me in thinking that section (B) should end with line 386 is that this line is very corrupt and contains ten syllables and although it is not more corrupt than many lines in Agn. poems, yet if we take out the word *home*[1] which seems to clash in sense with *rei* and re-write the line using good twelfth century forms, we get a perfectly correct line:

Al pöestëif rei Syer.

From this point onwards the lines are as regular as at any part of the poem.

§ 61. The couplet.

In his edition (*Romania*, XXV, pp. 497—541) of the interesting Agn. poem *Le Donnei des Amants*, G. Paris remarks: 'Notre poète est encore archaïque en ce qu'il est à peu près absolument fidèle à l'ancienne règle de versification exposée par P. Meyer, et d'après laquelle le sens est toujours arrêté au deuxième vers d'un "couplet" et ordinairement au deuxième vers de chaque couplet[2]. Il va même beaucoup plus loin et se rapproche, par la structure de son vers, des formes les plus anciennes du vers octosyllabique en français. Sur les 1242 vers de son poème qui nous ont été conservés, les huit dixièmes environ ont une quatrième syllabe qui porte l'accent tonique, et qui dans plus des deux tiers finit un mot (ou est pénultième avec élision de l'e final), tandisque dans l'autre tiers elle est pénultième sans élision. Des vers restants, la plupart ont une césure féminine avec accent à la quatrième syllabe (*Mires diënt que c'est santé*), et il n'y a guère qu'une vingtaine de vers en tout qui ne rentrent pas dans l'une ou l'autre de ces formules. Un pareil état de choses ne saurait être fortuit il suffit de mettre en regard

[1] In the life of St Audry in the same MS. the same scribe has made the same interpolation.

[2] In *Romania*, XXIII, pp. 1—35, M. Paul Meyer shows by very many examples that except perhaps for Adgar who is not careful of the couplet (it should be noted that, whereas English retains the etymological meaning of couplet, in modern French the word implies tirade or stanza) Agn. poets adhere to the rule of ending the sense with the couplet. He adds that for saints' lives this is generally the rule. The rule is observed too in those of the fourteenth century as e.g. Bozon, cf. *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.*, XXXIV, p. 295 and in those I have published, cf. footnote 4 of the introduction to St Osith. M. Meyer shows that the poet of importance who dared to break this rule is Chrétien de Troyes closely followed by Raoul de Houdenc. I am not aware that any Agn. writer has followed these innovations to any great extent.

de notre poème les 1200 premiers vers de *Perceval* ou de *Méraugis* pour voir que la proportion est tout autre....'

Considering our poem from the same points of view we find that the rule of the couplet may be said to have been observed almost without exception. Thus ll. 137—8 do not seem to be satisfactorily coupled and ll. 301—4 seem rather to be built up of three lines and one line, although the sense is complete with the fourth line, while ll. 329—331, 1471—3 and 1474—6 form what are probably the only real infractions; it should be noted, however, that these occur in (B) and in (A) only. Groups in which the sense is complete in two couplets are of course numerous, e.g. 1295—8, 1299—1302, etc. These infractions in (B) and in (A) are one of the many points for ascribing them to a later period than the main body of the poem.

§ 62. The line—syllabism.

An analysis of each separate line of the poem gives the following results:

A. Metrically correct octosyllabic lines:

		O		A		B	Total
		1210		277		204	1691
(1)	4+4, cesura after 4th syllable and ending a word	650		151		58	
	exs. ll. 13, 16, 38, etc.		1443		251		
(2)	Feminine cesura	107		23		17	
	exs. ll. 8, 20, 22, etc.		1491		218		
(3)	Césure enjambante	62		17		4	
	exs. ll. 7, 19		1516		192		
(4)	With feminine e after 4th syllable elided	49		12		4	
	exs. ll. 10, 30		1509		264		
(5)	Cesura after 5th syllable	69		11		10	
	exs. ll. 23, 78		1474		265		
(6)	Cesura after 3rd syllable	61		8		10	
	exs. ll. 80, 115		1503		259		
(7)	Cesura elsewhere	86		22		7	
	exs. ll. 45, 642		1598		280		
(8)	No cesura	24		4		13	
	exs. ll. 25, 50		1591		220		
(9)	Hiatus (cf. § 72)	30		7		3	
	exs. ll. 6, 14		1464		222		
	Total of octosyllabic lines	1138		255		125	
	Percentage of correct lines	94·05		91·6		61·25	

B. Metrically incorrect lines:

(*a*) Catalectic lines:

(1)	7 syllables (4+3)		7		—		6
	exs.	ll. 32				291	
(2)	7 (3+4)		2		2		1
	exs.	ll. 572		1576		256	
(3)	7—no cesura		2		—		5
	exs.	ll. 808				221	
(4)	7—cesura elsewhere		—		—		1
	ex.					270	
	Total of 7 syllable lines		11		2		13

(*b*) Hypercatalectic lines:

(5)	9=(4∪+4) epic cesura		7		5		18
	exs.	ll. 542		1580		249	
(6)	9=(5+4)		4		—		10
	exs.	ll. 898				232	
(7)	9=(4+5)		—		—		5
	ex.					273	
(8)	9—cesura elsewhere		4		3		13
	exs.	ll. 155		1449		215	
(9)	9—no cesura		1		—		2
	exs.	ll. 86				195	
(10)	Emendations made in footnotes or §§ 64–70		41		13		21
	Total of incorrect lines		64		22		82
	Percentage of incorrect lines		5·95		8·4		38·75

Comparing our results with those obtained for the *Donnei*, we find that they are almost precisely the same; in that poem two-thirds of eight-tenths (i.e. eight-fifteenths = 664 lines = 53·3 per cent.) are divided 4 + 4 or else have elided *e*, corresponding to our numbers (1) and (4); taking these for (O) we find our result is 57·8 per cent. and for (O) and (A) together 57·9 and for the whole poem 54·6 per cent. The remaining divisions do not exactly tally with our divisions; G. Paris does not state how he regards lines in his poem like:

(1) Tant poeit munter la parole 297,
(2) Esgardai les pomers floriz 13,
(3) Oï ses oiselès chanter 15,

which would have been classified in our tables under numbers (5), (6) and (7) respectively; but if we add the classes (3), (5), (6), (7) and (8) together we arrive at 24·9 per cent. which is practically the equivalent of

his four-fifteenth (or one third of eight-tenths as he says). That our poem should show an excess of regularity over the *Donnei* is quite in accord with the soberness of the subject.

§ 63. The line—position of the cesura.

The question whether the octosyllabic line has a cesura is much debated; the answer is certainly in the affirmative for a number of the oldest poems as the *Passion, vie de S. Léger, Gormunt et Isembart, Roman de S. Michel, Voyage de Brandan, Roman de Thèbes,* and the answer is possibly also the same for the *Roman d'Enéas, Roman de Troie* and the *Roman de Rou* and a great deal of the work of Marie de France. In a recent dissertation[1] the matter has been thoroughly gone into and a large number of texts carefully analysed. It is sometimes a little difficult to agree with the conclusions arrived at; thus e.g. the *lai Les dous Amanz* of Marie de France is stated to have 'einen Einschnitt in der Mitte' in 224 lines out of the 254, i.e. 88·2 per cent. I have examined this *lai* on the same plan as our poem (see preceding section) and should divide its lines in the following way: (1) 115, (2) 29, (3) 24, (4) 10, (5) 14, (6) 12, (7) 36, (8) 13. Therefore to arrive at the same results as the author of this dissertation we should need to agree that all lines except those under (5) and (6)—where the fifth and third syllable is tonic and ends the word—had an 'Einschnitt in der Mitte': but could the following lines be said to be so divided?

Exs. of (3), 24 in all:

(*a*) que mult est saive de mescines
tant cunuist herbes e racines 107—8.
(*b*) tels letuaires vus durra 113.
(*c*) cungie demande a s'amie 130.

Exs. of (7), 36 in all:

(*a*) ne le refreschisse le cors 147.
(*b*) ne m'arestereie a nul fuer 200.
(*c*) unkes si dolente ne fu 232.

Exs. of (8), 13 in all:

(*a*) car ne s'en poeit consirer 28.
(*b*) e par druërie l'amast 66.

I point this out because the author indicates that a percentage of over 80 per cent. of lines with 'Einschnitt' in the middle is necessary

[1] Melchior, *Der Achtsilbler in der altfranzösischen Dichtung mit Ausschluss der Lyrik.* Leipzig, 1907.

before it can be stated that such system is intentional on the part of the poet. I would rather take the stricter view of the octosyllable with cesura and put the dividing line at about 60 per cent. I am inclined to believe that so far as Anglo-Norman saints' lives are concerned a pause is intentional and that it is due to the influence of music which continued to work when such poems were destined only for reading aloud. A lengthy examination I have in hand tends to show that saints' lives differ enormously in this particular, whereas the life of St Audry (end of XII century) has under Nos. 1, 2, 4 (cf. § 62 A) only 53 per cent., another life—that of St Andrew (written probably about the same time and by a Frenchman resident in England)—has fully 90 per cent. of these lines. It would seem probable that the skill in 'psalmody[1]' often attributed to pious people in Agn. saints' lives could extend to skill in reading—and a good deal of skill must have been necessary to make the ill-built lines run at all smoothly—the lives of saints.

An interesting side-light on the part to be left to the reader (or speaker) of Agn. lines is to be found in the Latin directions for the actors in the old drama of Adam[2]...*et, in rithmis, nec sillabam addant nec demant, sed omnes firmiter pronuncient et dicantur seriatim que dicenda sunt.*

§ 64. The irregularity of the line.

In the preceding section I stated my belief in the existence of the cesura in the Agn. octosyllable. The fact is of prime importance for the discussion of the irregularity of the line. I have stated before that the octosyllabic line is in a vast majority of cases built up of two groups; these groups may be of a varying number of syllables. Further, a feminine *e*, mute in a large number of cases as befits its unimportance in pronunciation, may become sonant when its presence is required to build a group. I will take examples of this phenomenon rather from a faulty thirteenth century text than from this life of St Osith which, so far as regards the main bulk of the poem, is fairly accurate. Thus in the life of *St Richard* by Peter of Peckham, written about 1270 we find:

(1) after a liquid, feminine *e* is generally silent:

Par la bele maisun seinte eglise[3] 1103;

[1] In the life of St Audry we find: *Adammis ont icil a non, Mult ert de grant religion; En vigile et en salmodie, Menoit iceo prudom sa vie*, folio 111, verso b. This life is written by a nun, named Marie.

[2] *Das Adamspiel*, hgg. Gross, Halle 1907[2], Romanische Bibliothek, No. 6.

[3] This line, torn from its context, might appear to be a line without cesura, but it is not so.

but when the tendency to group is evident we have:

De la cure k'avant aveit 788.

(2) after a dental, feminine *e* is frequently silent:

Que tut*e* la bible pres oït 796;

but when it is desired to form a grammatical unity or group:

Ot comencié de tute part 174.

Dunc fu preisé de tute gent 506.

Tute l'esglise enluminerent 720.

(3) after a nasal, feminine *e* is generally silent:

K'a pein*e* les piez moveir poeit 985;

but to form a group:

Est ceste eglise cum lune bele 1118.

Sachez le veir en bone fei 1337.

(4) the ending *-ent* (*-eient, -erent*) is also often silent:

D'ovre de martel fur*ent* forgez 688.

K'il avei*ent* tel tresor perdu 755.

Juger*ent* leqüel le deust aver 605;

but to form a group:

Le loerent ke il amast 267.

(5) between consonants (especially *muta cum liquida*) feminine *e* is often silent:

Priveement a sei appella 1331.

Son chapelein k'especial aveit 1321;

but to form a group:

Sire William*e* sun chapelein 1373.

There is another phenomenon that strengthens my view, viz. that the line that has no cesura is not only rare but comparatively regular in scansion (cf. the tables, § 62). Again in cases where the line without cesura is too long or too short it is susceptible to very simple and evident emendation. Taking examples again from *St Richard* we find:

(6) after a vowel, feminine *e* is generally mute:

E jeo par l'aïe seint Richard 59;

but when the line has no pause:

Dunt joie de quer de li out 609.

Dunt jeo esteie tant grevez[1] 548;

(7) after a liquid, feminine *e* is silent:

De fer*e* dreiture ne se feint mie 636;

but when the line has no cesura:

E issi fere le soleit 781.

[1] This line could be emended to *...itant*, but the form only occurs once in the poem.

A sonant feminine *e* after a de tal, a nasal, in the ending *-ent* and between consonants (for mute *e* see Nos. (2), (3), (4), (5) above) is found in the following lines:

(8) E grant multitude de gent 1531.
(9) Veeir coment l'alme passa 1516.
(10) (*a*) Ke mal me furent par itant 549,
(*b*) Pur ceo chanterent sanglutant 1684.
(11) L'ercevesque e sun chancelier 714.

When then Professor Suchier says in his memorable review of Atkinson's edition of the *Vie de seint Auban* (p. 26): 'Sobald der Achtsilbler sechs oder neun Silben hat, ist die Cäsur obligatorisch,' I should agree with him, only I should add that *because of the cesura* such irregularity becomes possible. I should not like to suggest that the ear of the Agn. writer was absolutely at fault but the words of the defective hemistich must have been so pronounced as to produce an approximation to the necessary four syllables or at least have produced a similar effect. It would be hazardous to attempt to say how nearly or in what way a line containing one or two defective hemistiches was extended in pronunciation so as to approximate to the octosyllable but one or two remarks may not seem beside the point. It will be noticed in the following paragraphs and in the examples quoted by Suchier in the above-mentioned review that most of the defective hemistiches contain a diphthong and that when this diphthong had *i* as its second component that letter is represented by *y*[1]. This would certainly seem to be an indication as to the pronunciation to be adopted by the reader. Again that *é* could be diphthongal is proved by § 15, while the practice of inserting *y* or *i* before the tonic when a vowel follows (cf. § 15) and the frequent spelling of an accented vowel by double letters must surely point to change in pronunciation.

It seems to me that in this grouping or non-grouping must lie the explanation of the irregularity of the Anglo-Norman line.

§ 65. The line with 7 syllables.

A great many of the inaccuracies of an Anglo-French work in a MS. written in England must doubtless be attributed to the scribe, but one and the same scribe cannot be blamed for the difference in inaccuracy such as is found in our poem—7·2 per cent. for (O) and (A) combined and 38 per cent. for (B): this must be attributed to the authors.

[1] I am, of course, aware of the various criticisms of Suchier's theories, but they amount generally only to emending the exs. used, yet it is admitted by all that this may be carried too far; there is in every text a residue of defective lines not susceptible to emendation.

I have stated in the foregoing paragraph that I ascribe this inaccuracy mainly to the grouping or non-grouping, but firstly all reasonable efforts should be made to secure as accurate a text as possible. First I will consider the short lines in (O) and in (A).

32 This line consists of one correct group and another that has three syllables. I suggest that the second group was originally bor fu *cil* nez, but here also the word bour with diphthong suggests another explanation.

92 This line is emended in a footnote.

572 This line is defective in its first hemistich; this half line would possibly be read *tut a pi-yé*, the diphthongisation being rendered possible by the following vowel of *alé*; the emendation *trestot a* (or *de*) *pié* is also possible.

808 This line having no cesura should be emended; the emendation is obvious, the Latin text has *caput...ambabus manibus*; our text should therefore have *dous mains*.

844 Defective in the second hemistich; the future *ert* may be read *iert* diphthongally; it would be possible to emend to *sera*.

958 Defective in the second hemistich; here the diphthong of *vient* seems to explain the deficiency. I have noticed a short line again and again in Agn. with this word.

968 As there is no cesura emendation is necessary; I propose to insert *tut: De tut ceo....*

1034 After the impersonal verb *avint* a relative *ceo* should be inserted, cf. l. 322.

1186, 1254, 1336, 1385, 1405 are emended in the footnotes.

1576 In the text I have corrected on the grounds that the longer form appears in l. 1623, it would perhaps be better to allow the form of the MS. to stand and to insert a necessary co-relative *ceo* before *esprover*, the line would then fall into the two group system.

In (B) the faulty lines are much more numerous; in cases where the cesural pause is not strongly marked or where there is no cesura I propose to emend as follows:

190 Corr. *en* fere cert; the phrase requires à complement.

221 Use the form *Modwenne* as in line 217 and explain hiatus as in § 72.

225 Corr. *ceo* aveneit, a co-relative is lacking, cf. *Erec* 5809, *Cligès* 4440 and line 322.

256 Corr. *trestut* l'or.

291 Corrected in the text.

293 Read *amedeuz* as in line 341 which should become *amdeuz*.

296 It would seem simple to emend *come* en un puiz but the meaning is obscure since it is not clear whether the author means to say that Osith and her book were actually sunk in a hole in the river bed or whether the *krenke* is a *puiz*.

298 Corr. en *icel* duit.

323 Except for the instances in G. I have met the form *leus* only in the Agn. MS. of St Marie l'Égyptienne; *lues* means in Old French 'immediately,' but neither in that text nor here does this meaning seem to come out of the context. In *St Marie* it is emended in various ways by the other MSS.; it seems to me that here the text should read *iluec*, and this would then give the required eight syllables.

363 Use the form *Modwenne* as in line 217.

367 The line may be read with pause after *ewe*; cf. § 72.

373 Read *adonc*.

In making so many emendations in (B) I might seem to be abandoning the principles laid down in § 63, but this is only apparently the case; (B) is a thirteenth century episode and the faulty lines in poems of that century are so by reason of their hypermetric lines rather than by those that are too short; a glance at the tables in § 62 will show this; there the hypermetric lines for (O) are no more than 53 out of 1210 lines while (B) has 69 out of 204; therefore the short line in a thirteenth century poem is much more likely to be due to the scribe than is the hypermetric line[1]. In *St Richard* the lines with seven syllables did not amount to five per cent. of the incorrect lines and were readily emendable.

§ 66. The lines of 9 syllables with epic cesura.

The existence of this cesura is generally denied for all except a few of the oldest poems, e.g. the *Passion*:

> Jesus reis magnes est sus montez 26.
> Chantet aveient de Jesus Crist 28.
> Sus en la piedre li angles sist 401.

In other poems it is generally taken as a negligence. In certain Agn. poems however it occurs so frequently that I am inclined to see in it a recognised practice, a natural outcome of the division of the line

[1] This phenomenon is not without exceptions, e.g. in the life of St Thomas (cf. § 66) out of 432 lines 163 are short and 21 only too long according to the editor, while in the life of Edward the Confessor (1265) the first 700 lines contain 135 short lines and about 30 of 9 syllables.

into groups; it seems logical to assume that if the line may have an uncounted syllable at the end it may also have one at the pause in the middle. I have made a few statistics of the frequency of this line in Agn. octosyllabic poems:

Gaimar: *Estorie,* ll. 1000—2000	3 cases (ll. 1058, 1590, 1887).
Adgar: Theophilus legend (No. 17)	2 cases (ll. 62, 1005).
Vie de S. Gilles	no cases.
Adamspiel	6 cases.
Haveloc (ll. 1195)	4 cases (ll. 78, 294, 388, 788).

In these poems then it would be impossible to consider this as more than negligences on the part of author or scribe, but when we come to poems of the thirteenth century the number of such lines increases greatly; and we find:

Fragments d'une Vie de S. Thomas (circa 1220)	6	cases in	432	lines.
Vie de sainte Modwenne (first 100 quatrains)	15	„	400	„
Chardry: *Petit Plet* (circa 1230) ll. 1—400	28	„	400	„
St Richard (circa 1270) ll. 1—400	43	„	400	„

The cases of this kind of error in (O) seem to be like those of the first group of poems mentioned above; that is, negligences of scribe or poet and susceptible to emendation; thus:

176 The poem seems to me old enough to suggest that *ke* be omitted (cf. § 53, iii).

542 *ariere*: for this form read *arier.*

623 *esteient*: verbal endings were the first to be disregarded in scansion, especially where the cesural pause was at all marked. This I prefer to regard as a poet's negligence rather than to suggest the omission of *tut.*

695 This appears to be a faulty line, though *tant* may be due to the scribe.

696 Here *ke* may be omitted; *deable* as a dissyllable is well known and not merely in Agn.

793 *saillirent*: This might appear to be a case of omission of word ending as in line 623 above, but the line can be emended in two ways; by omission of initial *E* or by changing the tense to *saillent* in accordance with the tense of the second line of the couplet; this last commends itself best to me since the line has no cesural pause and according to § 64 the feminine *e* should be sonant.

1184 The initial *si* is not required; additions at the beginning of a line are among the usual contributions of scribes.

The cases in (A) can all be arranged in the one class; they consist in the uncounted *-e* or *-es* after the fourth syllable; such lines are 1473, 1475, 1486, 1580, 1616.

The cases in (B) are like those in (A) and prove that for the author the feminine *e* after the tonic accent may be mute, especially at the middle of the line: cf. ll. 213, 217, 242, 243, 244, 247, 249, 258, 268, 281, 285, 300, 308, 321, 333, 341, 345, 358.

§ 67. The line with tonic accent on the fifth syllable.

The four cases in (O)—there are none in (A)—are doubtless all due to the scribe; the following emendations are offered:

898 *avera*: the tense seems incorrect, read *a*.

1033 The pronoun *il* may be omitted; cf. § 48.

1099, 1244 These lines have been corrected in the footnotes.

The instances in (B) are more difficult of treatment; we must assume that the first hemistich containing five syllables must have been so pronounced as to be brought within the group. It is hazardous to do more than suggest how this was done.

215 The locution *a merveille* is probably due to the scribe, the usual Old French *merveilles* (cf. § 59) read with mute *e* would reduce the line.

232 Perhaps a shortened form of the name was used.

241 We may assume the pronunciation *ap'la*; cf. § 64 (5).

274 The pronunciation of *damisele* seems to have been whittled down to damzel (cf. English damsel) and the same form must be assumed for lines 315, 329, while in line 347 where the expression is more formal and the line without pause, we have the normal number of syllables.

287 Corrected in text.

313 The feminine *e* of *bele* must be mute (cf. § 64 (1)); this seems natural in a stock phrase like *bele suer*.

316 It seems difficult to assume the pronunciation *livr'* but instances are plentiful in Agn.

343—4 It is suggested in footnote to omit *ke*; cf. § 53 (iii).

350 This line has probably been altered by the scribe; though the raising of Lazarus is often referred to in Old French literature, e.g. *Jhesus lo Lazer suscitet* (*Passion*, l. 30), the phrase *al tierz jur* seems rather to refer to Christ's own resurrection; of Lazarus we read: *Venit itaque Jesus et invenit eum quattuor dies jam in monumento habentem* (Joannis xi, 17). I would propose to read: *Ki fu suscitez al tierz jur* (For the

tense in use in Agn. cf. *E cum il fu resuscité* in the Agn. anonymous translation of the *Evangile de Nicodème*, line 11, S. A. T.). I would further support this emendation by remarking that in none of the Latin texts of the Life of Modwenna which the author may have used as sources for the account of Osith's immersion is there any reference to Lazarus.

351 This should perhaps be explained as in l. 232; for *a peine* cf. § 59.

§ 68. The line of 9 syllables with accent on the fourth, i.e. with hypermetrical second hemistich.

212 In thirteenth Agn. the definite article is apt to lose its syllabic value, thus the second hemistich will form a group of four.

273, 284 Read *ew'*.

374 Old French reïne has been influenced in its development by *rei*, it is best to take this as an instance of its modern form *reine* with diphthongal *ei*.

380 *enseinement*: the feminine *e* is mute as in *St Richard* 3, § 64.

§ 69. The line of 9 syllables without cesura.

According to my remarks in § 64 these lines should all admit readily of emendation. Note there is only one in (O) and two in (B).

88 The initial *Kar* is to be omitted as an addition of the scribe.

195 Two solutions are possible (i) that the initial syllable of *dementers* is slurred—a frequent occurrence in Agn., cf. Suchier, *Seint Auban*, p. 34; Simund de Freine, p. liv and *St Richard*, § 72. (ii) that the *e* of *vie* is silent. Such lines are not uncommon in Agn., cf. *St Richard*, § 100. It must have been left to the choice of the reader to decide on the proper pronunciation.

226 The word *loinz* may be an insertion due to the scribe; in the life of Modwenna written by Geoffrey of Burton we find: *Modvenna fecit manere Atheam cum sorore regis* (*sc.* Editha) *in uno* [sc. *monasterio*, cf. ll. 218—9], *ipsa vero vacans orationibus aliquantis diebus solitaria mansit in altero...Editha...desideravit mittere aliquid ad magistram suam venerabilem Modvennam. Vocavit itaque puellam Osid et dicit ei: vade, inquit, ad dominam...et defer ei ex parte mea volumen istud.* The narrative gives us to understand further that the place of Modwenna's retreat was close by.

§ 70. The line of 9 syllables with cesura elsewhere.

Like the lines of the preceding paragraph, these should mostly be subject to emendation. We will first consider these in (O) and (A).

155 Read *example en prist de chasteté.*

528 Read *v'ray* and cf. § 5.

1049 Omit *cum* and cf. § 53 x.

1449 Omit *E.*

1451 Correct *manda*; cf. § 59.

1496 Omit *ke*; cf. § 53 i, iii, A.

The following in (B):

262 The feminine *e* of *message* is mute.

266 This is a case of doubtful scansion like line 195 in the preceding paragraph; either omit *kar* or consider the final *e* of *fere* as mute.

268 Read *pucel'.*

272 Read *Modwen* as suggested in § 67.

290, 344 Corrected in text.

327 Omit *ke*; cf. § 53 iii.

365—6 Omit *ja* and for *Osith* read *ele,* the name is rendered unnecessary by its appearance in the following line.

384 The enjambement entails a pause and brings about the mutation of the final *e* of *pere.*

§ 71. Other irregular lines.

These occur only in (B) and to a much less degree in (A).

205—6 The great irregularity of these lines is probably due to the scribe; in the list of Penda's pious descendants we only read of daughters (ll. 151—2) so that possibly the author only wrote:

E uncles de grant poësté
E auntes de grant chasteté.

210 Read *nul' maner'.*

214 Read *Modwen'* as suggested in § 70 and *abess'.*

235 The first hemistich must be read *exampl' trova.*

247 Read *doctrin'* and *el'.*

255 Corrected in text.

261 Read *v'nir*; for other instances cf., authors quoted, § 69, l. 195.

276 For *comensa* read the equivalent *se prist*; *se prendre* like *comencier* may be used without prepositional complement in Agn.

277 Read *river'*; the line is otherwise faulty.

286 The first hemistich consists of six syllables; it may have been read as *al prendr' s'abaiss'*.

301 This line has no cesura and so should be easily emendable: the sense seems to require 'when the dawn of the fourth day came.' I propose to adopt the reading of the MS. for line 269, *en la matinée*, and read *Del quart jur en la matinée.*

304 The original may have read *achoise* or *ochoise* and the group have been intended to be read *achois' saveir*; for initial *en* cf. § 6.

305 Read *El quer....*

308 The second group would be read *par sperital*; the word *espirit* and its compounds are of varying syllabic values in Agn.; cf. *Simund de Freine*, p. xlix.

328 Omit *vus* and read *verté*, a well-known form collateral with *verité.*

329 The first hemistich must be read *V'istes un' damsel'...*; cf. § 65.

330 Read *La matinée tierz jur fu hier*; the article may be readily omitted with expressions of time; cf. l. 334 and *Se vus y demoures tier jur li empereres et si traiteur ont pourparlé une grande traison*: Robert de Clari, *La Prise de Constantinople*, xxiii, 16; cf. Fredenhagen, *Über den Gebrauch des Artikels*, p. 17.

333 Read *Un' tel pucel'.*

372 Since there is no cesura, this line should be emended; it should probably read *Kar l'en le tendreit a fols gas.*

386 Cf. § 60.

The following two lines are in (A):

1438 The phrase *de Chich* is probably a gloss inserted into the text by the scribe.

1440 The *aset* seems to be spurious and may be deleted, it looks like the mental reservation of an interested scribe.

§ 72. Hiatus.

The question of hiatus in Old French poetry has received full and careful attention in the vast work of Rydberg on the history of feminine *e* in French[1]. It is extremely difficult to classify this phenomenon and examples appearing in one class may well find a place in another. The most salient divisions seem to be: A. Logical hiatus, where a final feminine *e* counts so as to allow the word its full syllabic value and to give it special prominence in the line. B. Metrical; in which the final feminine *e* must be counted to preserve the measure and the acceptance

[1] Gustaf Rydberg, *Zur Geschichte des französischen ə*. Upsala, 1896—1907, p. 1099.

of which division entails the acceptance of the theory of a cesura. C. Grammatical; in which a feminine *e*, becoming final by the decay of the dental ending yet remains unelided before a following vowel. D. Analogical; in which an *e* after a heavy consonant group retains its syllabic value even before a vowel.

As instances of these we will quote from Rydberg, taking Agn. exs.:

A. Out Rome / en baillie (6 sylls.), *Comput*, 1923.
Ki d'Africke / ala requerre (8 sylls.), *Tristan* (de Thomas), 665.

B. De la nue / eisut s'en sunt (8 sylls.), *Brandan*, 1667.

C. Ainz que pusse(t) / entrer païs (8 sylls.), *Brandan*, 616.

D. Pur espuser l'altre / Ysolt, *Tristan* (de Thomas), 307.

Our poem contains examples of all these kinds; the first group may be subdivided as follows:

A. Logical:
(*a*) Proper names—these may need special prominence;
1. Querondone / est apellée 184.
2. Modwene / en l'un sujurna 221.
(*b*) A pause in the sense;
1. Et martyre / a chef de tur 64.

This may be a case for emendation to the form *martirie* which may occasionally be found in rime with words in *-ie*.

2. E cele / en fait doil mut grant 1116.
3. Ceste overaine / endormir 1344.

(*c*) With *ne, ou, ke, le*;
(*α*) *ne*: Ne ci ne / ailleurs ja ne pert 6.
Ne / en pernent autre rançun 773.

It would perhaps be better to adopt the Agn. form *raansun* (cf. *St Gilles*, 2986). For other instances, cf. ll. 676, 1072, 1087, 1163, 1390, 1528, 1681.

(*β*) *ou*: Et meindre / ou ses chers amys 1691 (cf. below D).
(*γ*) *ke*: Ke / en puissez aveir aïe 124.
Also the lines 469, 805, 1146, 1327, 1403, 1487.
(*δ*) *le*: K'apertement le / unt vëu 1064.
(*d*) Vowel followed by *e* (*et*);
Ly reis escute / e entent 549 (cf. below C).

B. Metrical:
1. Ke de l'ewe / Osith n'issi 352.
2. L'ewe / ou Osith fu neée 367.
Also lines 1201, 1215, 1649.

C. Grammatical:
Bien li puisse / estre gradée 410.

D. Analogical: after a heavy consonant group;
1. Seinte / e dure e preciuse 74.
2. Et a creindre / e a doter 106.
Also lines 152, 159, 222, 233, 488, 687, 720, 1079, 1464, 1569.

Modern editors are admitting a greater use of hiatus than formerly. It is certain that it plays a great part in Agn. I have on hand a very lengthy inquiry into the octosyllabic line and its development, and in the 20000 lines I have already examined its use is evidently very extensive. It would be, however, premature to communicate any of the results here.

§ 73. Enjambement.

The feeling that secures careful observation of the rule of the couplet will make for regularity in the line itself and enjambement will be rare. The shortness of the octosyllabic line renders an overflowing into a successive line necessary occasionally. Thus Chrétien de Troyes and Raoul de Houdenc do not shrink from this licence. An enjambement such as the following[1] savours of flippancy:

Et n'an i a nul, qui n'et *un*
Baston cornu de corneillier (*Yvain*, 5514—5);

but others such as

1. Quant dui chevalier sont ansanble
Venu as armes an bataille (*Yvain*, 1694—5).
2. Chascuns grant piece mal tailliée
En ot; bien en furent peu (*Songe d'Enfer*[2]),

are very common.

Our poem contains the following cases:

In (B), 5 cases:

Et par les gerrons a sei (le) prist
Son mantel ke le livre obli 282—3.

Also lines 385—6, 399—400.

The enjambement that takes up the whole of the following line is very common in the octosyllable.

[1] Quoted by Tobler, *Versbau*, and Kastner, *Versification*; I quote it according to the last edition of *Yvain*.
[2] Quoted from Bartsch, *Langue et Littérature*, col. 244, ll. 19—20.

In (A) there are the following 4 cases:

D'iluec purveit queus enverreit
A Chich, kar ces fors mettreit 1471—2.

Also lines 1474—6 (2 cases), 1499—1500.

In the remainder of the poem we have only two cases:

E pense bien k'en son muster
Als païs doner a(vera) mester 897—8.
Ele est a seinte Osith par non
Venue par avision 1211—2.

Both of these are of the kind that is normal. In this particular again we see that the deviations from early continental usages occur most frequently in (B), less frequently in (A), and that they are not prominent in (O).

A. T. Baker.

Sheffield.

HÖLDERLIN AND 'DIOTIMA.'

FRIEDRICH HÖLDERLIN'S poetry is, in the words of Wilhelm Dilthey[1], 'in ihrer Weise ein Höchstes nach Goethe'; his life story is one of the most pathetic in the annals of literary history: yet neither his poetry nor his life has ever been adequately treated in English. The best account of the poet in our language, that of W. A. Braun[2], comes to us from America and is written from a point of view which necessarily spoils the perspective of the picture. Apart from this we have only a page or two in the histories of German literature and a column in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* which is marred by more than one serious error. In the following article no attempt is made to give a complete account of the poet's life or work, since to do this on an adequate scale would be out of the question in the space available. My chief aim at present is to place before the English reader the letters which passed, or were intended to pass, between Hölderlin and Frau Gontard after they were separated and before the poet's mind became clouded. These letters, or drafts of letters, as they may more properly be called, have been recently rescued from neglect by Dr W. Böhm, who was the first editor to print the fragments written in 1799 by Hölderlin to Diotima and to appreciate the importance of the fragment from Diotima to Hölderlin, part of which was given by Hölderlin's biographer and editor, Chr. Th. Schwab, in 1846. The original German text of these letters will be found in Böhm's selection of Hölderlin's letters[3]. For the sake of clearness and to remove some misconceptions, I preface the correspondence with a few notes on events in the poet's life before the Homburg period (1798—1800), during which these letters were written. The evidence adduced will, I hope, make it tolerably clear that Hölderlin's love for Diotima, though it put him temporarily in a difficult and painful position, was on the whole more beneficial than harmful to him.

[1] *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung*, 3rd ed., Leipzig 1910, p. 380.
[2] *Types of Weltschmerz in German Poetry*, New York, 1905. (Cp. *Modern Language Review*, vol. II, pp. 186—8.)
[3] W. Böhm, *Hölderlins Briefe* (*Auswahl*), Jena, 1910.

I.

On leaving Tübingen Hölderlin became tutor to the son of Major and Frau von Kalb. He left this post not merely, as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states, 'to attend Fichte's lectures and to be near Schiller in Jena,' or, as Wilbrandt[1] put it, out of 'Unmut..., als Erzieher wenig zu leisten und in seiner Selbstbildung sich gehemmt zu sehen.' These were at most secondary motives; the primary was the instinct of self-preservation. It is plain from his letters and from that of Frau von Kalb to his mother that his health was being undermined by his duties. His pupil was not only mentally feeble, but had contracted vicious habits, rendering it necessary for him to be watched day and night. Hölderlin clung to the task much longer than, for his own sake, he ought to have done, and gave it up only when he realised that it was hopeless.

The same elementary instinct of self-preservation drove him out of Jena, where he felt himself overpowered by the presence of such 'grosse Geister' as Fichte and in particular Schiller, before whom, he wrote later, he was 'like a plant that has just been set in the soil. At midday it must be covered up.' He retreated to Nürtingen where he soon became very unhappy, a victim to the 'Höllengeister' of remorse at the folly of running away. Yet at the time the step had been inevitable. Schiller's influence was dangerous, 'vernichtend,' as the wise Diotima saw and wrote later.

Then came, in Dec. 1795, the tutorship in the house of 'Banquier Gontard,' at first a period of almost unmixed joy, as we learn from the poet's letter of June 10, 1796 to his old college friend Neuffer, which tells how he has come into 'a new world.'...'There is a being in the world with whom my spirit can and will busy itself thousands of years, and even then still see how schoolboy-like all our thinking and understanding appears in the presence of Nature...' The summer and autumn of 1796 brought still more happiness. Gontard remained in Frankfort while the tutor accompanied his wife and children to Cassel and Driburg. On February 16, 1797 Hölderlin writes again to Neuffer from Frankfort, 'I have sailed round a world of joy since last we wrote to one another... And it is still so! I am still just as happy as in the first moment. 'Tis a continuous, joyful, holy friendship with a being

[1] *Hölderlin. Reuter* (*Geisteshelden*, ed. A. Bettelheim), 2nd ed., Berlin, 1896, p. 17.

that has simply lost its way into this poor, spiritless, disordered century of ours!...'[1]

But the horizon was growing dark. 'Whom the gods love, to him is apportioned great joy and great sorrow,'—such is the pathetic quotation with which this letter ends. Already in Oct. 1796 Hölderlin had written to Hegel words of bitter scorn about the 'society men and women of Frankfort.' In the house of 'Banquier Gontard,' a 'Frankfurter Geldmensch' of the most pronounced type, the tutor was treated by host and guests alike as a menial. He felt himself always 'the fifth wheel on the coach,' though obliged for form's sake to be present. How far his attachment to his employer's wife was remarked and scoffed at we do not know. At least it kept him bound in an otherwise hateful house for some two years after their return from Driburg (Sept. 1796), though already in July 1797 he wrote to Neuffer that he was 'torn in two by love and hate.' Then began the still more gruesome sensation of being haunted 'by the nothingness that yawns round about us like a precipice...' No doubt hateful things were being said: Diotima's reputation was perhaps itself at stake. Still Hölderlin delayed, culpably perhaps but very humanly, the inevitable parting. Not till the autumn of 1798 did the unhappy lover tear himself away from the house of torment,—'after holding out a great while with much patience.' The dramatic story of the jealous housekeeper poisoning the mind of the careless husband and by persistent insinuations goading him to a stormy scene with the lovers rests upon doubtful evidence and does not tally with Hölderlin's own account, which, however, scarcely reveals the whole truth[2]. To his mother he wrote on October 10,1798 to explain his sudden flight to Homburg vor der Höhe, where he had joined the sympathetic Sinclair. 'The rude pride, the purposeful, daily contemptuousness of all knowledge and culture, the direct expressions of the opinion that tutors too were mere servants, that they could not expect any special

[1] Somewhat perversely C. C. T. Litzmann maintained that Hölderlin never conceived the passion of love for Diotima: 'Diotima blieb ihm eine schwesterliche Freundin, sie war sein "Schutzgeist,"' he writes in his *Friedrich Hölderlins Leben. In Briefen von und an Hölderlin*, Berlin 1890, pp. 309 f. On the element of 'Übersinnlichkeit' in Hölderlin's love, cp. W. A. Braun, *op. cit.*

[2] W. Dilthey (*op. cit.* p. 387) says Hölderlin's departure 'geschah zweifellos aus eigenem Entschlusz.' Dilthey relied on the evidence of the poem *Der Abschied* and of the letter to his mother. But Hölderlin always spared his mother unpleasant details. If he was driven out of Gontard's house by some special insult, as is not unlikely, he would most probably not have told her more than he hints at in the letter. But the details of the scene were probably richly embroidered by gossip. K. Müller-Rastatt (*Friedrich Hölderlin, sein Leben und sein Dichten*, Bremen, 1894) accepts the whole story as given by C. Jügel in *Das Puppenhaus* (Frankfort, 1857). C. Litzmann thinks it a 'myth'; B. Litzmann that it was 'not altogether off the right track,' and that Hölderlin was probably subjected to some insult.

treatment, since they were paid for what they did and so forth, and many other insults hurled at me, just because it is good form to treat tutors thus in Frankfort,—all this sickened me—for all that I tried hard to disregard it—more and more all the time, and wrought in me oftentimes a silent wrath which is never good for body or soul. Believe me! I was patient! If you have ever believed one word I told you, then believe this! You will think that I exaggerate when I tell you that it is at the present day simply impossible to hold out long in such circumstances; but if you could see how much the rich merchants, particularly in Frankfort, are embittered by the present times, and how they vent this bitterness of spirit on everyone dependent on them, you would find what I say easy to understand.'

He refuses to say more, since he does not care to speak evil of these people, but proceeds: 'In the end I was forced to determine on the hard parting from the dear children... I explained to Herr Gontard that my plans for the future required that I should place myself for a time in a position of independence. I avoided all further explanations, and we parted politely from one another.'

The letter ends with some warm regrets for the loss of his pupil, Henri Gontard. 'He will never forget me nor I him.' There is not one word of Henri's mother, of whom his heart was too full to speak.

II.

The treatment meted out to Hölderlin by Gontard and his friends had cut him to the quick. 'Hatred of the common and unclean gnawed at his soul,' says Dilthey. The normally gentle spirit was goaded into a cry for vengeance, none the less anguished that it was only a cry and not an act:

> Wenn ich sterbe mit Schmach, wenn an den Frechen nicht
> Meine Seele sich rächt, wenn ich hinunter bin,
> Von des Genius Feinden
> Überwunden, ins feige Grab.....

Only his undiminished love for Diotima and his passionate desire to fulfil his poetic mission made life any longer desirable. In these first months at Homburg, in the end of 1798, his fears and sufferings wrung from him those two utterly pathetic cries, 'Nur einen Sommer gönnt, ihr Gewaltigen!' and 'Doch uns ist gegeben, Auf keiner Stätte zu ruhn...' 'I need peace,' he had cried at Frankfort: in the same spirit he had fled to Homburg, where his unfailing friend Isaac Eduard von Sinclair had found him a quiet lodging. This man's devotion to the

friend whose genius he realised and whose personality he loved, proved from this time forth so splendid in its quiet strength and self-sacrifice, that it shines out in the darkening gloom of the poet's life like some kindly star of hope. 'The last scion of an ancient Scottish family settled in Homburg,' Isaac von Sinclair was no unworthy member of his race.

In Homburg and in Rastatt, whither Sinclair carried him off to attend the political Congress, Hölderlin once more fell in with interesting intellectual society. In Sinclair's own family and in the court of the Landgrave of Hesse he was made a welcome guest. He was delighted with both families; Sinclair's he found 'vortreffliche,' the Landgrave's 'ächtedele Menschen.' 'At the court my book has given some pleasure and they have wished to make my acquaintance,' he wrote home with pardonable pride. But for the most part he lived alone or in the company of Sinclair. 'Every hour spent with such a man means spiritual gain and added joy for his companion.' 'Truly there can be but few friends who are so much each other's master and servant in one,' he adds, explaining to his mother how each of them was expected by the other's mother to play Mentor to her son. For the sake of greater independence Hölderlin had refused to live in Sinclair's house, and 'having once again turned hermit' in obedience, as he puts it, 'to my nature and my Fate,' he saw scarcely anyone save his friend Sinclair, and a Professor Muhrbeck of Greifswald whose philosophic but 'restless spirit' Hölderlin highly esteemed. Outwardly he wanted for nothing essential, for he was able to rent 'a pair of pretty little rooms'—the living room he adorned with the maps of the four quarters of the earth—and such furniture as satisfied his simple wants. Sinclair and Muhrbeck provided him with almost too rich 'a flow of soul' for one who needed to remain 'undistracted and far from the spell of other men's ideas and interests.' 'This apart, the peculiar beauties of the neighbourhood around me make my one source of delight....I live close to the open fields, have gardens in front of my windows and a hill with oak trees, and scarce a couple of steps take me into a beautiful vale of meadowland. Thither I go forth, then, when I am weary of my work, climb up the hill, sit me down in the sunshine and look away beyond Frankfort into the far distances, and so these innocent moments give me back courage and strength to live and toil. Dear Sister! It is as good as though one had been in church, when one has thus felt with pure heart and open eye light and air and the lovely earth' (Letter to his sister Heinrike, early in 1799).

Surely the poet's eye dwelt long on Frankfort's towers before it sought the distance. Parted from Diotima only by those few miles of country he could still write to her and may perhaps have had meetings with her, though this is now uncertain. Her picture, we know, was indelibly imprinted on his mind. The parting from Frankfort, says Dilthey, 'was a new and hard experience that set him apart from life and his fellow-men. "Mit einer furchtbaren Ausschlieszlichkeit" his gaze remained henceforth unalterably fixed upon the holy thing that had appeared to him in Diotima. No everyday circumstance of life had any value for him henceforth. The dangerous separation of his real life from his ideal dream became complete in this hour[1].' Of this we have evidence in those few precious letters or drafts of letters exchanged or meant for exchange between the lovers. They bear out too the words of Marie Joachimi-Dege, 'the hopelessness of this love and the inward loneliness remained for both and grew perforce ever more acute.' Characteristically Frau Gontard was quicker to realise this than was her dreamy lover. One fragment we possess dates from the end of June 1799. In it the disheartened poet pitifully contrasts his own poverty of soul with the glory of 'great men,' his mind doubtless running upon Empedocles and other heroes of antiquity with whom he now above all sought familiar converse. The text, which we owe to Böhm's researches, demands translation in full:

'Day after day I must call back the vanished divinity. When I think about great men, in great times, and how, a sacred fire, they seized on all around them, and changed all that was dead, wooden, the world's straw, into flames, and the world blazed up with them to heaven, —and then on myself, how often I go about, a little glimmering lamp, ready to beg one drop of oil, so as to shine a while still through the night, lo! there passes a shuddering through all my limbs, and in a whisper I call out to myself a terrible word: "Dead, thou art dead in life!"

Do you know why it is? Men fear one another, fear lest the genius of one should eat up the other and therefore they grudge each other, not indeed food and drink, but all that nourishes the soul, and cannot endure it, when something they say and do is seized on by others for spiritual food and changed into flame. The fools! As though anything at all that men could say to one another were aught but firewood, that

[1] Yet, as Adolf Wilbrandt pointed out (*op. cit.*, p. 31), to have remained at Frankfort, in the circumstances, would have destroyed 'the remnant of his spiritual powers.' 'Flight alone made it possible for him to pull himself together through the act of resignation.'

only when it is seized by the spiritual fire turns into fire again, even as it went forth out of life and fire. And do they but grant each other the right to nourish themselves from each other's store, then both of them live and give light and neither eats up the other.'

The foregoing paragraph probably refers to the anxieties arising from his plan to start a journal, to which reference will be made later, But the end of the letter takes on a lyrical note of remembered joy:

'Do you recall our untroubled hours, when we and we alone were close to one another?—That was triumph! Both so free and proud and alive in the bloom and glory of spirit and heart and eye and visage, and both in such heavenly peace beside one another! Did I not even then guess it and say it: "one might wander the whole world over and hardly find such a thing again." And every day I feel it deeper and deeper.'

It seems that this fragment was not sent; perhaps Hölderlin dared not reveal so much of his feelings. Another fragment written in these days met the same fate. It ends thus:

'Moments of joy I still have, it is true. But can that replace a world of them? And this it is that makes me true to you forever. This person and that have many an excellent point. But a nature like yours in which all is so united in one inward indissoluble living bond, this is the pearl of the age, and whoever has recognised it, and how its heavenly, inborn, peculiar happiness is also at the same time its deep unhappiness, he too is forever happy and forever unhappy.'

A few months after leaving Frankfort Hölderlin was able to send Frau Gontard his completed *Hyperion*, writing in it the touching words: 'To whom else but to thee?' With the book went, or was to go, another letter of which we also have the draft[1]. Of still higher value is the letter from Diotima which was once read by Chr. Schwab and of which W. Böhm has rediscovered a draft for the genuineness of which he vouches. His authority may be accepted: the letter itself bears the stamp we should expect to find. It is the letter of a high-souled, clear-eyed woman, in whom deep affection has not blinded but sharpened the vision. These two letters must be given in full:

'Herewith our Hyperion, Dear!' writes the poet. 'After all, this fruit of our soul-full days will give you some little pleasure. Forgive me for letting Diotima die. You remember, we could never quite agree about this in those days. I considered it necessary in view of the whole

[1] W. Böhm dates it 'about Easter 1799,' thus making it the *first* of our three ragments.

situation. Dearest! All that is said here and there of her and of us, of the life of our life, take it as a sort of thanks that is ofttimes all the truer, the less skilfully it is expressed. Had I been able at your feet step by step to form myself into an artist in peace and freedom, verily I believe I should have become one, and my heart yearns after this in all sorrow with tears and in the broad light of day and often in unspoken desperation. Truly it is cause enough for all the tears we have wept for years that we should not have the joy that we can give one another, but the wrong cries out to Heaven, if we must think that we two must go under with all our powers at their best, because we are kept apart. And see, that makes me many a time so silent, because I must beware of such thoughts. Your sickness, your letter—it came so clear before my eyes, for all that I blind them to it at other times, that you are suffering, always suffering—and I, boy that I am, can only weep over it! Which is better, tell me, that we hold our peace about what is in our hearts, or that we tell it to one another? Always I have played the coward, to spare you,—have always acted as though I could put up with everything, as though I had simply been a ball made for men and circumstances to kick about, and had no stout heart in me beating, dearest life, steadfast and free in its own right for the best that was in it; have often refused and denied to myself my own dear love and the very thought of you: wholly and solely that for your sake I might live through this fate as peacefully as possible. You too, you have continually fought, peaceful one! in order to have peace, have with heroic strength suffered and kept silent about what could not be changed, have hid away and buried the eternal choice of your heart, and hence it comes that there is so often darkness before our eyes, and we no longer know what we are and have, scarcely recognise ourselves any longer; this everlasting struggle and contradiction within the heart, assuredly this must slowly kill you, and if no God can quiet it there, I too have no choice but to kill myself with care for you and me, or else to regard nothing else but you, and with you to seek a way that will end the struggle for us.

I have before now thought that we too could live on self-denial, that perhaps it would make us strong too to say goodbye to hope,.....'

The sentence was, it may be, never finished. There is no more writing save, upon the back of the sheet, the cry of resignation

Pure, to be pure in heart,
This is the highest
Wise men have conceived,
Wiser men wrought.

Diotima answered[1] with strong words of comfort that reveal much of her deep hold upon the poet. She was riper in experience, calmer, and therefore stronger than her romantic lover. So she realised, as he did not, that their present task was to turn their eyes away from a love which could only exist in dreams and cut off the dreamers from their true relations to life. Here is the fragment that has been saved:

['Frankfort o. M., September 1799.]

.....The more one has to say, the less one can say. Send me the Hyperion by Sinclair; it is impossible for me to buy it for money[2]. I would like to dream forever, yet dreaming is self-destruction and self-destruction is cowardice. Love is a relation that exists in the world of reality that surrounds us, not in the spirit alone, the senses too (not sensuality) belong to it; yes, love that we remove altogether from reality and feel only in the spirit, love to which we could give no nourishment and no hope, would in the end become a mere dreaming or it would vanish from before us, it would remain, but we would know it no more and its beneficial influence upon our hearts would cease. I feel that our love is too holy for me to deceive you.

The passion of the highest love assuredly never finds its satisfaction upon earth, feel it with me, this search for it would be folly; to die with one another—but silence, it sounds like visionary romanticism, and yet is so true—is the satisfaction. It is easy for men to let live what they do not in reality care about; it is only what they can envy that they would like to destroy[3].'

So without many words, she turns aside to a practical matter and sends the poet a significant warning not to fall under the paralysing influence of Schiller's overwhelming personality:

'Do not return to the place whence with torn feelings you came for shelter to my arms. I must confess it to you; it frightened me a little, your writing to me you intended in a certain event to follow the advice and decision of Schiller. Will he not seek to bring you into his own neighbourhood? Will not this flattering call simply lead you into the wrong path? If it should hereafter prove so, oh, then think of our love and its countless miseries!

[1] It is not clear to which letter of Hölderlin's this is the answer. W. Böhm dates the Diotima-fragment variously September (in the text) and August (in the introduction to his selection of letters). Hölderlin's last fragment (see pp. 204 ff.) he regards as the answer to this of Diotima.

[2] The copy sent by Hölderlin had not yet reached her.

[3] The writer means, 'We must go on living as a duty, and men can do no great harm to us *now*.'

Schiller—assuredly you could not avoid going to him, very likely it would be extremely pleasant for you, and what sentiments I should have in that case, I felt clearly enough from the beating of my heart, when I passed a few hours in that house, a house in Weimar bei Jena, which Schiller was about to remove into.—I know well, such weaknesses are folly in sight of love's high ideal and deserve condemnation, but yet in our human sense of love! Have a care, you understand me! The influence of noble natures is as necessary to the artist, as is the light of day to the plants, and just as the light of day is reflected in the plant, not as it is in itself, but only in the many-hued, earthly play of colours, so noble natures do not find themselves, but scattered traces of their own excellence, in the manifold creations and plays of the artists....'

In the vagueness of the warning is reflected the trouble of Diotima's foreboding. Too proud to conceal her jealousy of Schiller's power she feared too much ill from his influence over her lover's development as a poet to be able to keep back the dark but pregnant warning. No man —least of all Hölderlin—could forget such a woman's love. Yet she was right when she bade him make the effort, right too when she feared that his nature might be swallowed up by a stronger than itself. Self-destructive dreaminess was his most immediate danger, and, next to this, self-contemptuous relaxation of the effort to express himself. His salvation lay only in his passion for his own poetry. For the present he remained at Homburg, and in toiling at his drama, *The Death of Empedocles*, sought the anodyne he must have if he were not to dream himself into utter 'other-worldliness' and euthanasia. To his love-poems was added in the last months at Homburg[1] the priceless *Complaint of Menon for Diotima*, in which Menon's spirit is shown wandering restlessly over hill and dale, by the springs and through the woods, in search of rest, like the wounded stag that flees into the thicket, uttering its mournful cry and pierced through with the dart:

> Thus, O ye dear ones! I seem to myself, but, ah! is there no man
> Who will have pity and lift from my brow the sorrowful dreaming?

This 'sorrowful dreaming' lay henceforth always over his eyes, but as yet it rarely found expression. He wrote many letters to his family, but spoke only in the vaguest terms of his inward 'sufferings,' though he confessed later to having been attacked by 'a sickliness that lasted almost the whole winter and a part of the summer too.' In the effort to forget and in the passionate desire to use his brief spell of independ-

[1] It was perhaps not finished, but part of it at least was written there.

ence to the full he had overworked himself, and at the same time he had both underfed himself and gone without necessary warmth, this last on account of the 'enormously high price of wood.' In Frankfort he had saved up 500 fl. and thought himself thus 'economically secure for at least a year.' But he had not counted on sickness; by April, 1799, he was obliged to think of accepting from his anxious mother 100 gulden—to be regarded simply as a loan. He had just received a notable encouragement. A. W. Schlegel, reviewing Neuffer's *Taschenbuch für* 1799 in the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, had singled out Hölderlin's contributions as alone worthy of praise and 'full of soul and spirit.' The critic further wished him good luck with his promised 'longer poem' (*Empedocles*) to which Hölderlin had referred, in the touching lines *An die Parzen* which I must quote in the original:

Nur *einen* Sommer gönnt, ihr Gewaltigen!
Und *einen* Herbst zu reifem Gesange mir,
Dasz williger mein Herz, vom süszen
Spiele gesättiget, dann mir sterbe!

Die Seele, der im Leben ihr göttlich Recht
Nicht ward, sie ruht auch drunten im Orkus nicht;
Doch ist mir einst das Heil'ge, das am
Herzen mir liegt, das Gedicht, gelungen:

Willkommen dann, O Stille der Schattenwelt!
Zufrieden bin ich, wenn auch mein Saitenspiel
Mich nicht hinabgeleitet; *einmal*
Lebt' ich, wie Götter, und mehr bedarf's nicht.

Slowly his health returned and his spirits improved again. 'Once more,' he writes, 'I have grown young again with the spring, and I look out upon life with new courage and new strength. Insolent, impatient, immodest I never can and never will again become towards Him who guides my fate.'

But something had to be done and that quickly if he was to hold out in Homburg. In June 1799, he revealed to Neuffer a new project in which he showed himself once again a singular optimist. 'I have in mind to bring out a poetical monthly;.....the first numbers will include a tragedy of mine, The Death of Empedocles, which I have finished, all but the last act....' The contents were to be 'aesthetic' and to appeal, in the main, to ladies. Every month were to appear some four sheets, or 64 pages, octavo, 'not too closely printed.' 'I shall take care that every annual volume, so far as possible, includes at least one complete poetical work of considerable length, for example, a tragedy or a novel, etc.' He hoped for contributions from Heinse, Bouterwek, Matthisson, Conz Siegfried Schmid and Neuffer himself. The latter's friend, Steinkopf

of Stuttgart, was induced to act as publisher[1], but on reflection demanded a stronger list of contributors, including Goethe, Humboldt, Fichte and Schelling. Hölderlin only knew one great author intimately, and to him he turned once more in the hour of his need. In spite of Diotima's warning some fatal instinct seems to have drawn Hölderlin irresistibly towards the one man who seemed still to have the power, if only he had the will, to establish his younger fellow-poet firmly beyond the fear of hungering for bread.

Even while at Frankfort he had sent Schiller several poems, not all of which were accepted, for the more the younger poet developed his own style the less it appealed to the elder. Schiller, no longer clear about his protégé's genius, had returned some well-meant advice without seeing that Hölderlin had ceased to follow in his steps. On July 5, 1799, the would-be editor again appealed to him, in a rather painfully formal and apologetic letter, 'with the immodest request' for a few contributions to his projected 'humanistischen Journale.' In an even more laborious letter he made the same request of Schelling, harping in what he himself calls a 'clumsy introduction' upon the fact that the new journal would take up the 'standpoint of the so-called humanism.' Schelling answered that he could only offer some 'lecture-notebooks.' Schiller eventually ([Aug. ?] 24, 1799) replied that he would very gladly help, if he were not himself so excessively busy, and proceeded to warn his countryman against carrying out the project. His own sixteen years of editing periodicals had been so 'little favourable' that he could not 'as an honest friend' advise Hölderlin to try his luck. He would gladly help with more than mere advice, he said, in closing a rather brief letter, and would be 'in a better position to make some proposal,' if Hölderlin would 'inform him more clearly of his present position.'

The latter summoned all his courage to meet this blow which was fatal to the unborn journal. In his letter to Diotima—it is the last fragment of their correspondence we possess—he revealed the whole bitter truth to the one being who would give him complete sympathy:

[Homburg, September[2], 1799.]

Dearest!

The uncertainty of my affairs was the sole cause of my not writing before. The project of the journal, about which I wrote you

[1] One learns with astonishment that Hölderlin had so far overrated his own powers of production as to offer to supply Steinkopf's *Damenkalender* with at least four sheets (64 pp.) every year without payment!

[2] All the internal evidence points to September as the month of writing. Taking July 5 as the beginning of the two months lost in preparations we reach the *first week* in September. Cf. p. 205, note 4.

previously, not without good grounds, with so much confidence, seems to me on the verge of shipwreck. I had counted on it with so much hope for my influence and my sustenance and my being able to remain there[1] in your neighbourhood; and now I have had to experience a great many unpleasant truths in addition to seeing all my trouble and all my hopes come to nothing. I had made a safe, unassuming plan; my publisher would have something more brilliant; I was to engage a number of famous writers, who he imagined were friends of mine, as contributors, and although I guessed at once that no good would come of this attempt, I was fool enough to let myself be persuaded, in order not to appear too stubborn, and so my kind heart, that will be trying to please everyone, has brought me into a quandary of which I am sorry to say I must write you, because my future position, that is to say, practically, the life I live for your sake, probably depends upon it. Not only men of whom I was rather the admirer than the friend, but friends too, Dear, and among them some who could not refuse me a certain amount of assistance without real ingratitude—have left me up to now —without answer, and I have been living now fully eight weeks in this state of waiting and hoping, my existence all the time more or less hanging in the balance. What the cause of this reception may be, God alone knows. Are people so utterly ashamed of me?

Yet that this can in reason scarcely be the case is proved to me by your judgment, noble lady, and by the judgment of some few who have remained faithful to me and stood by me in my difficulty, for example, Jung in Mainz, whose letter I enclose. Only the famous, whose assistance was to serve poor, *un*famous me as a shield[2], the famous turned a deaf ear to me, and why should they not? Everyone that makes himself a name in the world seems indeed to take away some portion of their glory; they are no longer the one and only gods; in short, it seems to me that a certain amount of trade-jealousy is mixed up with their feelings, for they are human like myself, I imagine[3]. But it does not help me much to realise this. I have lost nearly two months over preparations for the journal.....[4].

[1] 'für...meinen *dortigen* Aufenthalt.' The adjective is curious; why not 'hiesigen'? There seems no room for doubt that Hölderlin was writing from Homburg.

[2] Or the words ('zum Schilde') may mean 'like (an attractive) sign (on a modest inn).'

[3] This would seem to give the sense of the phrase, 'bei ihnen, die ich mir ungefähr als meinesgleichen denken darf.'

[4] The words omitted state his intention to ask Steinkopf to take what he had prepared for the Journal and publish it in another form. The statement is important for the dating of the fragment, a fact which has, I think, escaped notice. On October 8 Hölderlin wrote to his mother that, while he had given up 'die eigentliche Herausgabe und ganze Besorgung

And so then I have in mind to devote all the time that still remains to me to my tragedy: that will probably be a quarter of a year or so, and then I must go home or to some place where I can support myself by means of private lectures or other subsidiary occupations, since there is no hope of doing so here.

Forgive me, Dearest, this straightforward language! It would only have been harder for me than telling you what was absolutely necessary, if I had given utterance to that which my heart expresses toward you, Dear; and it is, too, nearly impossible in a fate like mine to preserve the needful courage without thereby momentarily losing the tender tones of the innermost life. It was just for this reason that I wrote hitherto.....'

The end of this fragment is missing and we have no other, though we know that the poet never ceased to cherish in his mind the image of the woman he had so intimately loved and who had so nobly and purely returned his affection. From this time until the end of his life he had, so far as we know the facts, no further direct communications with her. There is no room here to trace the last faltering steps of his way down to mental darkness. It remains only to state clearly the fact that Hölderlin's passion for Diotima had very little to do with his unhappy end. His insanity, of which the first symptoms occurred in 1801, was due, according to the most recent pathological inquiry, to what one may call purely physical causes. Like Lenz, Hölderlin fell a victim to 'dementia praecox catatonica,' a kind of sudden mental decay which attacks patients of all classes and antecedents about the age of 25—30 and is not materially affected by their previous mental experiences. Windelband's theory that Hölderlin's downfall was due to his failure to reconcile the complications of modern life with the beautiful simplicity of his idealised Greek world must also give way to the more sober explanation of modern science.

Once more, the story that Hölderlin's sudden departure from Bordeaux was occasioned by the news of Diotima's death must be relegated to the limbo of fables, as indeed C. C. T. Litzmann pointed out in 1890[1]. On June 30, 1802, Sinclair wrote to Hölderlin,

des Journals,' his 'Buchhändler' was to pay him 11 fl. a sheet, 'wenn er Lust hat, meine Beiträge zu dem Journale nach einiger Zeit besonders zu drucken und herauszugeben.' It would seem that Hölderlin had written to Steinkopf and received his answer since penning the fragment to Diotima. This correspondence might easily have occupied three to four weeks.

[1] The story is repeated, with dates to suit, in the latest edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1910). Yet Litzmann's *Life of Hölderlin* appears in the bibliographical note to the article.

'On the 22nd of this month (Frau) G(ontard) died of the (German) measles, on the tenth day of her illness.' Hölderlin, however, as Litzmann proved from his passport, left Bordeaux on May 10, 1802, and had reached Straszburg by June 7. Where and when he heard of Diotima's death we have no means of knowing. Nor does it greatly matter, for he was already, to some extent at least, out of his mind. Waiblinger records that he never spoke in later years of Frankfort or of Diotima; nor would he listen to questions about them. The subjects were too painful; any mention of either excited him dreadfully for days together. Once he brought himself to begin an *Ode to Diotima*; of this Waiblinger printed four pathetic lines which we may quote in conclusion and leave without comment to tell their own tale:

An Diotima.

Wenn aus der Ferne, da wir geschieden sind[,]
ich Dir noch kennbar bin, Dir Vergangenheit,
o Du Theilhaber meiner Schmerzen,
einiges Gute bezeichnen Dir kann....

Marshall Montgomery.

Giessen.

THE S. PANTALEO TEXT OF DANTE'S LETTERS TO THE EMPEROR HENRY VII, AND TO THE PRINCES AND PEOPLES OF ITALY.

§ I.

SINCE my previous article[1] was printed I have received photographic reproductions of the Latin text of Dante's letters to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII), and to the Princes and Peoples of Italy (*Epist.* V), as contained in the S. Pantaleo MS. (*Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8), a fourteenth century MS.[2], in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome. This MS. also contains the text of the early Italian translation, attributed to Marsilio Ficino, of the letter to the Emperor, which has been preserved in a number of other MSS. The Latin text of this letter is preserved in two other MSS., namely the Vatican MS. (*Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat.* 1729), of the fourteenth century, and a Venetian MS. (*Cod. Marc. Lat.* XIV, 115), of the fifteenth. The Latin text of the letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy is preserved in one other MS. only, the Vatican MS. aforesaid, in which, however, there are numerous more or less considerable hiatus.

A transcript of the Vatican text of these two letters, with variant readings from the various printed editions, and, in the case of *Epistola* VII, from the Venetian MS., was printed in the article referred to above. As the S. Pantaleo text has never been printed, nor even collated by the editors of Dante's letters[3], I now subjoin a transcript, with an *apparatus*

[1] *The Vatican Text* (*Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat.* 1729) *of the Letters of Dante*, in *Modern Language Review*, VII, 1—39.

[2] See Barbi, in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. II, 23. It probably belongs to the latter half of the fourteenth century. Colomb de Batines, who describes the MS. in his *Bibliografia Dantesca* (II, 208—9), assigns it to the first half of the fifteenth century. Besides the letters of Dante above mentioned this MS., which belonged at one time to Celso Cittadini (1555—1627), contains the text of the *Divina Commedia*, lyrical poems of Dante and Guido Cavalcanti, and other matter (see De Batines, *loc. cit.*).

[3] Since this was written I have seen a notice in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* (N.S. XVII, 77—9) of an article by P. Wagner on *Die Echtheit der drei Kaiserbriefe Dantes im Lichte der Kritik*, in which an account is given of the three MSS. (including the S. Pantaleo MS.) containing the text of *Epist.* VII. I have been unable as yet to obtain a copy of this article.

criticus, in which are registered variants, in the case of *Epistola* VII, from the Vatican and Venetian MSS.; and, in the case of *Epistola* V, from the Vatican MS., in which, as already stated, the text is incomplete. I have appended a list of proposed emendations in the Oxford text[1] of these letters, in addition to (or, in one or two cases, in substitution of) those printed in the previous article.

As in the transcript of the Vatican text, the contractions of the MS. have been expanded, the expansions being printed in italics. The 'punctuation' of the MS., which, as often, is more or less haphazard, has been preserved, so far as it has been possible to distinguish it in the reproduction. The folios of the MS. [140ro—143vo] are indicated in the transcript; as are the lines (numbered in round brackets) of each separate folio. For convenience of reference each letter, as before, has been broken up into sections, numbered [in square brackets] to correspond with the numbering of those in the Oxford Dante; and the titles, which in both letters are written continuously with the text in the MS., have been detached and printed as separate paragraphs.

§ II.

Epistola VII (*To the Emperor Henry VII*).

In the MS. the title of this letter, consisting of four lines all but one word, begins at l. 4 of fol. 140ro, ll. 1—3 being occupied by the colophon of the Italian translation. The text of the letter immediately follows the title, without a break, at the end of l. 7, and ends in the middle of l. 30 of fol. 141vo. The colophon, which begins a fresh line, occupies ll. 31—2 of the same fol.

In the *apparatus criticus* Vat. indicates the Vatican MS., Ven. the Venetian MS., and Ital. the Italian translation contained in this MS.

(4) Gloriosissimo atq*ue* felicissimo Triumphator*j*[2] / *et* dom*in*o sing*u*lari dom*in*o Henricho[3] (5) diuina pr*o*uidentia Romanor*um* Regj[4] / *et* senp*er* Augusto deuotissimj suj (6) Dantes alagher*ii*[5] Florentinus / *et* exul inmeritus / ac vniu*er*saliter om*n*es (7) Tuscj[6] / quj pacem desciderant / terre obsculum ante pedes.

[1] In my previous article (*M.L.R.* VII, 4) I spoke of the Oxford text of the letters of Dante as 'the latest.' My attention has since been drawn to the edition published at Florence in 1910 by Sansoni, under the editorship of G. L. Passerini. Some remarks on this edition will be found in the *Addenda* at the end of the present article.

[2] Ven. *Sanctissimo T.*; in Vat. the title is wanting; Ital. *Al gloriosissimo et felicissimo triunfactore.*

[3] Ven. *Henrico.* [4] Ven. *rege.* [5] Ven. *Aldigherij.* [6] Ven. *Thusci.*

[§ 1.] Inmensa (8) dej dilectione testante / relicta nobis est[1] pacis hereditas / ut in sua (9) mira dulcedine / militie nostre dura mitescerent / *et* in vsu eius (10) patrie triumphantis[2] gaudia mereremur. At liuor antiqui *et* inpla-(11)-cabilis hostis / humane prosperitatj semper *et* latenter[3] insidians / non (12) nullos hexeredando uolentes / ob tutoris absemtiam nos[4] alios impie[5] (13) denudare[6] inuitos. Hinc diu super[7] Flumina confuxionis deflevimus / et (14) patrocinia iustj regis incessanter[8] implorabamus[9] / quj[10] satillitium seuj (15) tyrannj disperderet / *et* nos in nostra iustitia reformaret. Cumque tu (16) cesaris *et* Agustj successor / Apenninj juga transiliens veneran-(17)-da singna tarpeia[11] retulistj / protinus longa substiterunt suspiria / (18) lacrimarum/que diluuia[12] desierunt / *et* ceu titan preoptatus[13] exoriens / (19) noua spes latio seculj melioris effulxit. Tunc plerique vota (20) sua preuenientes in iubilo / tam saturnia rengna / quam virginem rede-(21)-untem / cum marone cantabant.

[§ 2.] Verum quia sol noster siue de-(22)-sciderij feruor hoc summoneat[14] / siue faties veritatis / aut morarj (23) jam creditur aut retrocedere subputatur / quasj Iosue denuo uel (24) amos filius jmperaret / Incertitudine[15] dubitare compellimur / et [fol. 140vo] in vocem precursoris irrumpere / sic tu es qui venturus es[16] / an alium expec-(2)-tamus. Et quamuis longa sitis / in dubium que sunt certa / propter esse propinqua / (3) ut assolet furibunda deflectat / nichilomjnus jnte[17] credimus *et* speramus / (4) asseuerantes te dej[18] ministrum / *et* ecclesie filium / *et* Romane (5) glorie promotorem. Nam *et* ego quj scribo tam pro me / quam pro alijs (6) uelut[19] decet / Imperatoriam maiestatem / benignissimum vidj *et* (7) clementissimum te audiuj / cum pedes tuos / manus uitas[20] tracta-(8)-runt / *et* labia mea debitum persoluerunt / Cum[21] exultauit in me (9) spiritus meus cum tacitus dixj mecum / ecce angnus dej / ecce (10) qui tollis[22] peccata mundj.

[§ 3.] Set quid tam sera moretur segnities (11) admiramur / quando jam victor / in ualle victor Heridianj[23] / non secus (12) tussciam derelinquis / pretermictis *et* negligis / quam si vita[24] tutanda[25] (13) jmperij

[1] Vat. *est nobis.* [2] Ven. *triumphis.*
[3] Vat. *lataner*; Ven. *conlatenter.* [4] Vat. *non.*
[5] Vat. *impios*; Ital. *crudelmente.* [6] Vat. Ven. *denudauit*; Ital. *spollio*
[7] Ven. *semper.* [8] Vat. *incensanter.* [9] Ven. *imploraauimus.*
[10] Ven. *et qui.* [11] Ven. *turpia.* [12] Ven. *diluuię.*
[13] Ven. *precipitatus*; Ital. *innanzi desiato.*
[14] Vat. *summoueat*; Ven. *submoueat*; Ital. *admonischa.* [15] Vat. *in certitudine.*
[16] Inserted above the line. [17] *Sic.* [18] Vat. omits *dei.*
[19] Ven. *uel.* [20] So apparently MS.; above is written *alias meas*; Vat. Ven. *mee.*
[21] Vat. *tunc.* [22] Vat. Ven. *tollit.*
[23] Vat. Ven. *iam dudum in ualle uictor heridani.* [24] Vat. Ven. *iura.*
[25] Ven. *tuendi.*

circumscribj liginer*anj*[1] finib*us* arbitreris. Non pr*o*rsus ut (14) suspicam*ur* aduer*t*eris[2] / q*uoni*am romanor*um* glor*i*osa pote*st*as / nec metis ytalie (15) nec tricornis[3] europe margine cohartat*ur*. Nam *et* si vim passa / in (16) augustum[4] / gubernac*u*la sua *con*traxerit[5]. vndique tam*en* de inuiolabilj ju*re* (17) fluctus amphytretis[6] attingens[7] / vix ab inutilj vnda occeanj / se (18) circu*m*cingj dingnat*ur*. Scriptum *et* enim nobis est / Nascet*ur*[8] pul-(19)-cra troianus origine cesar. Imperij[9] occeano famam q*ui* t*er*minet (20) astris. Et cum vniu*er*saliter orbem describj edixisset aug*ust*us / ut (21) bos no*st*e*r* euangliczans / accensus ingnis eternj[10] flam*m*a remigit[11] / (22) si non de iustissimj principatus aula pr*o*disset[12] edictum / vnige-(23)-nitus dej filius / homo factus / ad[13] *pro*-fitendum[14] se*cund*um n*atur*am assu*m*p-(24)-tam / edicto[15] se subditum / nequaquam tu*n*c nassc*j* de virgine (25) uoluisset. Non enim suasisset in iustum[16] / quem om*n*em iustitia*m* (26) implere decebat[17].

[§ 4.] Pudeat itaq*ue* in angustissima[18] mundj (27) area irretirj[19] / tam diu / quem mundus om*n*is expectat / *et* ab (28) augu*sti*[20] circum-spectione non defluat / q*uod* Tuschana[21] tyran*n*is in (29) dilat*ion*is fidutia confortat*ur* / *et*[22] cotidie malingnan*t*ium coartan*d*o[23] (30) super*b*iam / vires nouas accumulat / temeritatem temeritatj (31) adiciens. Intonet iter*um*[24] / vox[25] illa curionis in cesarem. / Dum [fol. 141ro] trepidant[26] nullo firmmte[27] robore partes. Tolle moras semper nocuit[28] dif-(2)-ferre paratis. Par labor at q*ue* metus[29] pretio maiore petuntur. (3) Intonet[30] illa vox increpitantis a nubib*us*[31] iter*um*[32] in enea*m*. Si[33] te nul-(4)-la mouet

[1] So apparently MS.; Vat. Ven. *ligurum*; Ital. *lombardia*.
[2] Vat. Ven. *aduertens*. [3] Ven. *iriconis:*
[4] Vat. *non Augustum*; Ven. *in Augustum*; Ital. *in strectecza*.
[5] Ven. *contraxit*. [6] Vat. *amphitritis*; Ven. *Amphitricis*. [7] Vat. *attigens*.
[8] Vat. *Scriptum etenim uobis est nascetur*; Ven. *Scriptum est enim nascetur*; on the margin of our MS. is the reference .·. *Virgilius in vj eneydos*; the first word of each line of the quotation is preceded by ⊂ to indicate that it is a quotation.
[9] Vat. Ven. *Imperium*. [10] Ven. omits *eterni*. [11] Vat. Ven. *remugit*.
[12] Vat. Ven. *prodiisset*. [13] Ven. *factus qui ad*.
[14] Ven. *proficendum*. [15] Ven. *edicit*. [16] Vat. Ven. *iniustum*.
[17] Ven. *qui omnem iusticiam implere debebat*. [18] Ven. *angusta*.
[19] Ven. *metiri*. [20] Ven. *augusta*. [21] Vat. Ven. *Tuscana*.
[22] Ven. *ut*. [23] Vat. *cohortando*; Ven. *cohartando*.
[24] Ven. *igitur*; Ital. *un altra uolta*. [25] Ven. *uos*.
[26] On the margin is the reference .·. *Lucanus in primo libro*; the first word of each line of the quotation is preceded by ⊂ as before.
[27] So apparently MS.; Vat. *firmate*; Ven. *firmari*.
[28] Ven. *nocuit semper*. [29] Ven. *mętas*.
[30] *Intonet* is preceded by ⊂ as if it and the following words were part of the quotation.
[31] Vat. *a nubis*; Ven. *Annubis*; Ital. *descesa del cielo* *.
[32] Ven. omits *iterum*.
[33] In the margin is the reference .·. *Virgilius in iiij Eneydos*; each line of the quotation being indicated by ⊂ as before.

* On the question as to whether the correct reading is *Anubis* or *a nubibus* here, see my article in the *Bulletin Italien*, XII, 1—5 (Janv.—Mars, 1912).

tantarum gloria rerum. Nec super ipsa tua moliris[1] laude (5) laborem. Asscanium surgentem et spes heredis Iulij[2] Respice Cui ren-(6)-gnum[3] ytalie romanaque tellus[4]. Debentur *etcetera*[5].

[§ 5.] Iohannes namque regius primoge-(7)-nitus tuus / et rex quem post diej orientis occasum mundi successiua (8) posteritas prestolatur[6] / Nobis est alter aschanus[7] / quj vestigiam[8] man-(9)-gni genitoris obseruans in turnos / vbique sicud leo deseuiet et in la-(10)-tinos[9] uelud angnus[10] mitesscet. Precaueant sacratissimj regis alta consci-(11)-lia / ne celeste iuditium / samuelis illa uerba reasperet. Non ne cum par-(12)-uulus esses[11] in oculis tuis / capud in tribubus[12] ysrael factus es / vnxit que te (13) dominus in regem / et[13] mixit te dominus[14] in viam[15] et ayt / vade et interfice (14) peccatores Amalech. Nam et tu in regem sacratus es / ut Amalech per-(15)-cutias[16] / Agag[17] non parcas[18] / at que ulciscaris illum quj misit te de (16) gente brutali[19] / et de festina sua sollempnitate / que quidem et amalech (17) et agag[20] sonare dicuntur.

[§ 6.] Tu mediolanj tam uernando quam yemando (18) moraris / et ydram pestiferam per capitum amputationem veris[21] (19) extinguere / quod si[22] mangnalia gloriose alcide[23] recensuisses / te ut illum (20) falli congnosceres[24] cuj pestilens animal capite repullulante[25] multiplicj (21) per dampnum cresscebat / donec instanter mangnanimus[26] / vite principium (22) jmpetiuit. Non et enim[27] ad arbores extirpendas[28] / ualet ipsa ramorum[29] (23) incisio / quin iterum multiplicius virulente[30] ramificent[31] / quo usque ra-(24)-dices incolumes fuerint ut prebeant alimentum. Quid preses[32] (25) unice mundj peregisse preconijcis[33] / cum ceruicem cremone de-(26)-flexeris contumacis / Non ne tunc uel Brissie[34] uel Papie rabies (27) in opina[35] turgescet. Inmo que cum etiam flagellata[36] resederit (28) mox alia / Vercellis uel Pergamj / uel alibj returgebit /

[1] Vat. *molitis.*
[2] Vat. Ven. *Iuli.*
[3] Vat. *regimen.*
[4] Vat. Ven. *regna.*
[5] Vat. Ven. omit *etcetera.*
[6] Ven. *prosteritas prestoletur.*
[7] *Sic.*
[8] *Sic*; Vat. Ven. *uestigia.*
[9] Ven. *latino.*
[10] Vat. *agnos.*
[11] Vat. *esset.*
[12] Ven. *tribus.*
[13] Vat. *unxit que te dominus in Regem super israel et*; Ven. *unxitque deus in regem et.*
[14] Vat. Ven. *deus.*
[15] Vat. *uia.*
[16] Vat. *percuciens.*
[17] Vat. *ut agag*; Ven. *et Agagi.*
[18] Ven. *parcas minime.*
[19] Ven. *de gente in gentem brath bratali.*
[20] Ven. *Agagi.*
[21] Vat. Ven. *reris.*
[22] Vat. *quia si.*
[23] Vat. *gloriosi alcide*; Ven. *gloriose alcidę.*
[24] Ven. *cognosceris.*
[25] Ven. *repupulare.*
[26] Ven. *magnanimis.*
[27] Ven. *Non enim.*
[28] Vat. Ven. *extirpandas.*
[29] Ven. *Romanorum.*
[30] Vat. *uirulenter*; Ven. *uia terre.*
[31] Ven. *ramescent.*
[32] Ven. *qui prees.*
[33] Vat. *preconicis*; Ven. *preconiis.*
[34] Ven. *Nonne ut tuo vel tu brixię.*
[35] Vat. Ven. *inopina.*
[36] Ven. *flagellum.*

donec (29) huiusmodj scatescentie causa radicalis[1] tollatur / *et* radix[2] tantj erroris (30) euulsa cum trunco rami pungitiuj[3] arescant.

[§ 7.] An ingnoras ex-(31)-cellentissime[4] principum[5] / nec de specula[6] summe celsitudinis [fol. 141v°] deprehendis / vbi vulpecula fetoris istius venantium secura recumbat[7] / (2) quippe nec pado precipitj nec tiberj tuo criminosa potatur[8] / verum sarnj flu-(3)-enta torrentis ad huc ritus[9] eius inficiunt / *et* florentia[10] / forte nescis (4) dira hec pernities nuncupatur. Hec est vipera uersa in visscera genitricis / Hec (5) languida[11] pecus / que gregem dominj suj sua contagione conmaculat[12] / Hec (6) mirra scelestis *et* impia in amore patris[13] amplexus exestuans / Hec ama-(7)-ta jlla impatiens / que repulso fatalj connubio / quem fata[14] negabant / (8) generum sibj adscire non timuit / set furialiter in bella uocauit[15] / *et* de-(9)-mum male ausa luendo laqueo se suspendit vere matrem viperea (10) feritate dilaniare contendit[16] / dum contra romam cornua rebellionis exa-(11)-cuit / que ad ymaginem suam at que similitudinem fecit illam vere fu-(12)-mos euaporante[17] sanie vitiantes exalat / *et* inde uicine[18] pecudes *et* inscie[19] (13) contabescunt / dum falsis illiciendo[20] blanditijs *et* figmentis / aggregat (14) sibj finitimos / *et* infatuant[21] aggregatos / vere in paternos ardet[22] ipsa con-(15)-cubitus / dum improba pro capacitate[23] conatur / Summi pontificis[24] quj pater (16) est patrum / aduersum te uiolare assensum[25]. Vere dej ordinationj resistit[26] / (17) proprie voluntatis[27] ydolum venerando / dum regem suum[28] aspernata legi-(18)-timum / non erubesscit insana / regi non suo / jura non sua / pro ma-(19)-le agendj[29] potestate pacisscj / set adtendat ad laqueum[30] mulier furi-(20)-ata quo se innectit / Nam sepe quis in reprobum sensum traditur / (21) ut traditus faciat ea que non[31] conueniunt que quamuis in iusta[32] sint opera / (22) iusta tamen supplicia esse noscuntur.

[1] Vat. *huius scatascentie causa radicalis*; Ven. *huinsmodi rabies*; Ital. *la radiceuole cagione di questo piczighore.*
[2] Vat. *tollatur et radice*; Ven. *tollatur radice.*
[3] Ven. *pugitiui.*
[4] Vat. *excellentissiue.*
[5] Ven. *principinm.*
[6] Ven. *speculo.*
[7] Vat. *decumbat.*
[8] Ven. *potant.*
[9] Vat. Ven. *rictus.*
[10] Ven. *Florentiam.*
[11] Vat. *Hec est languida.*
[12] Vat. *pecus gregem domini sui sua contagione commaculans.*
[13] Vat. *in Cinare patris*; Ven. *in Cinere posita*; Ital. *nello amore del padre.*
[14] Ven. *qnem semper.*
[15] Vat. *sed in bella furialiter prouocauit.*
[16] Ven. omits *luendo—contendit.*
[17] Ven. *fumo euaporantes.*
[18] Ven. *uicinię.*
[19] Ven. *uiscie.*
[20] Ven. *aliciendo.*
[21] Vat. *infatuat*; Ven. *insinuat*; Ital. *fa impazare.*
[22] Ven. omits *ardet.*
[23] Vat. Ven. *improba procacitate*; Ital. *con maluagio uageiamento.*
[24] Ven. *summnm pontificem.*
[25] Vat. *ascensum.*
[26] Ven. *restitit.*
[27] Ven. *uoluntati.*
[28] Vat. Ven. omit *suum.*
[29] Vat. *agenda*; Ven. *agende.*
[30] Ven. *accendit ad laqueum*; Ital. *adtende el laccio.*
[31] Ven. *etiam.*
[32] *Sic*; Vat. *iusta.*

[§ 8.] Eya itaq*ue* rumpe moras pr*o*les (23) alt*era*[1] ysay / su*mm*e tibj fidutiam de oc*u*lis d*omi*nj dej sabaoth / coram quo (24) agis / *et* goliam[2] h*unc* / infunda[3] sapientie tue[4] at[5] in lapidem[6] virium tuar*um* (25) prosterne / q*uoniam* jn eius occasu / vox[7] *et* umbra timor*is* castra filistinor*um*[8] (26) operiet / fugient filistey[9] / *et* liberabit*ur* ysra*el* / Tunc h*e*reditas n*o*stra qua*m* (27) sine intermissione deflem*us* ablatam / nobis erit in integrum re-(28)-stituta. At que*m*admodum[10] sacro *sanc*te jer*usalem* memor*es* exules in ba-(29)-billone gemisscim*us* jta tu*n*c ciues *et* respirantes in pace *con*fuxionis (30) miserias[11] in gaudio re-colemus[12].

(31) Scriptum in Tuscia sub fonte sarni xv[a][13] kal*end*as maias / diuj fau-(32)-stissimj Herricj[14] cursus ad ytaliam Anno primo[15].

Proposed emendations[16] *in the Oxford text of Epist.* VII.

Title. *For* Sanctissimo triumphatori, *read* (*with MS.*) Gloriosissimo atque felicissimo t.[17]

l. 9. *For* impius, *read* (*with MS. and Ven.*) impie[18].

l. 106. *For* in via, *read* (*with MS. and Ven.*) in viam[19].

l. 138. *For* decumbat, *read* (*with MS. and Ven.*) recumbat.

l. 160. *For* alliciendo, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) illiciendo.

Colophon. *For* XIV Kal. Maias, *read* (*with MS. and Ven.*) XV Kal. Maias[20].

§ III.

Epistola V (*To the Princes and Peoples of Italy*).

In the MS. the title of this letter, which consists of three lines and one word, begins at the top of fol. 142[ro]. The text, which, as in the previous letter, immediately follows the title without a break, begins at the second word of l. 4, and ends in the middle of l. 7 of fol. 143[vo]. There is no colophon.

[1] Ven. *alta*; Ital. *secundo*. [2] In MS. the *o* is superscript. [3] *Sic*.
[4] Ven. *sue*. [5] Vat. Ven. *atque*. [6] Vat. Ven. *lapide*.
[7] Vat. *nox*; Ven. *nos*. [8] Ven. *phylistinorum*. [9] Ven. *philistei*.
[10] Vat. *At quem admodum*; Ven. *At quidem admodum*. [11] Ven. *miserius*.
[12] Ven. *reuelemur*. [13] Ven. *xv°*; Ital. *a die xvi d'aprile*.
[14] Ven. *diui Henrici faustissimi*. [15] Vat. omits colophon.
[16] In addition to, or in substitution of, the emendations proposed in my previous article (see *M.L.R.* VII, 12—13).
[17] Vat. omits the title; the only authority for *sanctissimo* is Ven.; the reading of our MS. is confirmed by the Ital. *Al gloriosissimo et felicissimo trionfatore*.
[18] This reading is confirmed by the Ital. *crudelmente*.
[19] This is also the reading of the Vulgate (I *Regum* xv, 18, in A.V. I *Sam.* xv, 18), from which Dante is here quoting *verbatim*.
[20] Vat. omits the colophon.

In the *apparatus criticus* Vat., as before, indicates the Vatican MS.; Tc. = Torricelli (1842)[1]; T. = Torri (1842); F. = Fraticelli (1857); G. = Giuliani (1882); O. = Oxford Dante (1904)[2]; Ital. indicates the Italian text of the early translation attributed to Marsilio Ficino[3].

Univ*er*sis et sing*u*lis ytalie regibus et senator*i*bus alme urbis nec (2) non ducibus marchionibus / Comitibus[4] / atq*ue* pop*u*lis umilis (3) ytalus Dantes Alegherij[5] / florentinus *et* exul / inmeritus orat (4) pacem[6].

[§ 1.] Ecce nu*n*c[7] *tempus* / accetabile[8] quo / singna surgu*n*t *con*sola-(5)-tio*n*is *et* pacis / nam dies noua splendescit ab ortu auroram[9] (6) demostra*n*s que iam tenebras / diuturne calamitatis atte-(7)-nuat / Iam que aure orientales / crebescu*n*t / Rutilat celu*m* (8) in labiis suis / *et* Auspitia Gentiu*m* blanda serenitate (9) *con*fortat. Et nos Gaudium expetatu*m* uidebimus q*uod*[10] (10) diu p*er*notauimu*s*[11] in deserto / q*uoniam*[12] titan exorietu*r* pacificus (11) *et* iustitia sine sole quasi[13] / eliotropiu*m* hebetata / cum (12) primu*m* Iubar ille uib[illegible][14] / reuirescet[15] / sa-(13)-turabuntu*r* omnes / qui exuriu̇nt / et sitiu*n*t in lumine radioru*m* (14) eius[15] / et *con*fundentu*r* / qui diligu*n*t iniquitatem A fatie (15) coruscantis / Arrescit[16] nam*q*ue aures mis*e*ricordis[17] / leo fortis / (16) de tribu iuda / atq*ue* ullulatum / univ*er*salis captiuitatis (17) mis*e*rans / moysen

[1] As stated in my previous article (*M.L.R.*, VII, 32), the Latin text of this letter was first printed by F. Torricelli in the *Antologia di Fossombrone* for 22 Oct. 1842. Since that article was printed I have been provided, through the courtesy and generosity of Mr G. W. Harris, Librarian of the Cornell University Library, with a transcript of Torricelli's text from a copy of the *Antologia* (the only one I have been able to hear of) in the Fiske Dante collection in that Library. I am now able to state that the 'unidentified MS.' from which Torricelli printed his text, the *provenance* of which he did not reveal, is none other than the Vatican MS. The same hiatus occur in Torricelli's text as in that MS., and allowing for copyist's errors and for arbitrary emendations, the text is the same throughout. Torricelli's text, therefore, has not the independent authority with which it has hitherto been credited. A complete collation of this text is here given for the first time.

[2] For details as to the editions of Torri, Fraticelli, Giuliani, and the Oxford Dante, see previous article, *loc. cit.*, p. 5.

[3] See previous article, *loc. cit.*, p. 32.

[4] Hiatus in Vat.; the missing words, *ducibus marchionibus comitibus*, were supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*a' duchi, marchesi, conti*), by F. and subsequent editors; T. read *necnon gentibus*; Tc. leaves hiatus.

[5] Vat. *Alagerij*.

[6] Hiatus in Vat.; the missing *-at pacem* was supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*prega pace*), by T. and subsequent editors; Tc. leaves hiatus.

[7] Hiatus in Vat.; the missing words, *ecce nunc*, were supplied conjecturally from Ital. (*ecco ora*), by T. and subsequent editors.

[8] Tc. reads *Ecce nunc tempus, tempus acceptabile*.

[9] Hiatus in Vat., which was filled conjecturally (on the hint of the fragmentary *al* in Vat.) by T.G. *alborem*, Tc. F.O. *albam*.

[10] Vat. *qui*; so Tc. [11] Vat. *pernotitauimus*. [12] Tc. *quum*.

[13] F. *quasi ad*; G.O. *quasi ut*. [14] Vat. *uibrauit*; Tc. *vibrarit*.

[15] Blank in MS. where there has been an erasure.

[16] So also Vat., for *arrexit*. [17] Vat. *misericordes*; Tc. *misericordiae*.

alium suscitauit / qui de Grauam*in*ibus (18) egipitior*um* po*pu*lum suu*m* eripiet Ad t*er*ram / lacte Ac mele[1] (19) manan*tem* / p*er*duc*en*s.

[§ 2.] Lectare[2] i*am* nu*n*c mis*er*anda ytalia etia*m* (20) sarrace*n*is que[3] statim inuidiosa p*er* orbem uideberis / quia spon-(21)-sus tuus mu*n*di solatiu*m* *et* glor*i*a plebis tue / clemen*tissimus*[4] (22) hericus[5] diuus *et* Aug*ust*us *et* Cesar / Ad nuptias p*ro*perat / esicca (23) lacrimas *et* merror*is* uestigia / dola[6] pulch*er*rima na*m* p*ro*pe est (24) qui liberabit te de carc*er*e impior*um* / q*ui* percutie*n*s mallignan*tes* (25) in[7] ore gladij p*er*det eos / *et* uinea*m* suam Aliis locabit agri-(26)-colis / qui fructu*m* iustitie reddan*t* / in t*empo*re messis.

[§ 3.] Set (27) an no*n*[8] miser*e*bit*ur* cuiq*uam*[9]. i*m*mo ingnoscet / omnibus m*isericord*iam (28) implor*an*tibus / cum sit cesar / *et* maiestas eius de fonte (29) defluat / pietatis / hui*us* iuditiu*m* omnem seuer*i*tate*m* abhorret / (30) et semp*er* citra mediu*m* plecte*n*s ultr*a* mediu*m* pre-liando[10] se fig*it*. (31) Anne p*ropter*ea neq*uam*[11] hom*in*um applaudet audatias[12] *et* initis[13] / [fol. 142vo] p*re*sumptio*n*um[14] p*ro*cula[15] / p*ro*pinabit. absit q*uoni*am aug*ust*us est / *et* si au-(2)-g*ust*us nonne rellapsor*um* facinora uindicabit[16]? *et* usq*ue* in tessalli*am* (3) in qua finalis dillect*ion*is[17].

[§ 4.] pone sanguis[18] longobardor*um* choadut-(4)-tam barbarie*m* / et si q*uid* de troianor*um* latinor*um* q*ue* semine sup*er* est (5) illi cede / ne[19] cu*m* sublimis aq*ui*la fulguris instar descende*n*s (6) affue*r*it / abiectos uideat pullos ei*us* / et p*ro*lis p*ropri*e locu*m* coruulis (7) occupatu*m*. eia facite scandinauie sobboles ut cui*us* m*er*ito trepi-(8)-datis aduen*tum* / q*uod*[20] ex uobis est p*re*sentiam sitiatis[21]. nec se-(9)-ducat alludens[22] cupiditas more syrenu*m* nescio qua dulcedine (10) uigiliam *ration*is mortifican*s* / p*re*occupetis[23] fatie*m* eius in *con*fessio*ne* (11) subiect*ion*is /

[1] Tc. *melle et lacte.* [2] *Sic*; Vat. *letare.* [3] Tc. *quia.*
[4] Tc. *clemens.* [5] *Sic*; Vat. *henricus.* [6] *Sic*; Vat. *dele.*
[7] Blot in MS., but *in* is just legible.
[8] Vat. *Sed non an*; Tc. *Sed an*; T.F.G.O. *Sed an non.*
[9] Tc. *cuique*; T. *Augustus*; Ital. *d' alcuno.*
[10] *Sic*; Vat. *premiando*; so Tc.; Ital. *meritando.*
[11] Tc. T. *nequiorum.* [12] Tc. *audaciis.*
[13] So also Vat.; Tc. *initibus*; T.F.O. *initiis*; G. *rictibus.*
[14] Tc. *praesumptorum.* [15] *Sic*; above is written, *alias pocula.*
[16] Tc. *facinora non judicabit.*
[17] Vat. *usque in tesaliam persequetur. tesalia inquam finalis delectionis*; for *delectionis* (Vat. = *deletionis*) Ital. has *dilezione*; Tc. *usque in Thessaliam persequetur Thessalia igne finalis deletionis.*
[18] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *pone sangu...*; the missing letters of *sanguis* are supplied by T. and subsequent editors; Ital. *O sangue de' Longobardi, pon giuso.*
[19] Hiatus in Vat.; *ne* is supplied by Tc., T. and subsequent editors.
[20] Tc. *quantum.*
[21] Vat. *scitiatis*; T.G. *sentiatis*; Ital. *vogliate* (v.l. *godiate*).
[22] So also Vat.; Tc. T.F.G.O. *illudens*; Ital. *ingannatrice.*
[23] Vat. *preocupatis*; Tc. *praeoccupate.*

et in psalterio[1] penitentie iubiletis[2] / considerantes quia[3] (12) potestati resistens dei ordinationi resistit / *et* qui diuine ordinationi rep-(13)-pungnat / uoluntati omnipotentie choequali rechurerat[4] / *et* durum est contra (14) stimulum calcistrare[5].

[§ 5.] Vos autem qui lugetis oppresi[6]/animum sulleua-(15)-te quoniam[7] prope est uestra salus / assummere[8] rastrum bone umilitatis (16) atque glebis exuste animositatis occatis / agellum sternite mentis (17) uestre / ne forte celestis imber / sementem uestram ante iactum. preue-(18)-niens in uacuum de altissimo cadat / non[9] resiliat[10] gratia dei ex uobis (19) ros[11] cotidianus / ex lapide set uelud fecunda uallis / concipite ac ui-(20)-ride germinetis / uiride dico fructiferum[12] uere pacis / qua quidem (21) uiriditate uestra terra uernante / nouus agricola romanorum consilij / (22) sui boues ad aratrum affectuosius *et* confidentius coniugabit. parci-(23)-te parcite iam ex nunc olrimi[13] qui mecum iniuriam passi[14] estis / ut (24) hectoreus pastor uos oues de ouili suo cognoscat cui et-(25)-si animauertio[15] temporalis diuinitus est indulta tamen ut eius boni-(26)-tate[16] redoleat a quo uelud a punto bifurcatur petri cesarisque (27) potestas / uoluptuose familiam[17] suam corrigit / set ei uoluptuosius (28) miseretur[18].

[§ 6.] itaque si culpa uetus non obest / que plerumque suppi-(29)-natur ut coluber *et* uertitur[19] in se ipsam. huic[20] utrique potestis ad-(30)-uertere pacem unicuique preparari. *et*[21] insperare[22] letitie iam priuitias[23]

[1] Vat. *et psalterio*; so Tc.; Ital. *e nel saltero*. [2] Tc. *jubilate*.
[3] Tc. *quod*. [4] *Sic*; Vat. *recalcitrat*; so Tc.; Ital. *recalcitra*.
[5] *Sic*; Vat. *calcitrare*; Ital. *calcitrare*. [6] *Sic*; Vat. *oppressi*.
[7] Tc. *quia*. [8] Vat. *asumite*; so Tc.; Ital. *pigliate*.
[9] Tc. *non enim*. [10] Vat. *resiliet*; so Tc.; T.F.G.O. *resiliat*; Ital. *torni indietro*.
[11] Vat. *tanquam ros*; so Tc.; Ital. *siccome*.... [12] Tc. *fructiferorum*.
[13] So apparently MS.; Vat. *o carissimi*; so Tc.; Ital. *o carissimi*. [14] Tc. *pasti*.
[15] *Sic*; above is written what appears to be, *alias animauersio*; Vat. *animaduersio*; so Tc.; Ital. *provvisione* (v.l. *divisione*).
[16] Vat. *bonitatem*; so Tc. [17] Tc. *familiae*.
[18] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *uoluptuose famili miseretur*; the missing words are supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*desiderosamente la sua famiglia corregge, ma più volenterosamente misericordia tribuisce*), by T. *voluptuosae familiae libentius m.*; F.O. *voluptuose familiam suam corrigit, libentius vero ejus m.*; G. *voluptuose familiae suae m.*; Tc. leaves hiatus.
[19] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *plerumque suppi et uertitur*; the missing words are supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*spesse volte come serpente si storce ed in se medesima si travolge*) by T. and subsequent editors, *plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur*; Tc. *plerumque supervenit et vertitur*.
[20] Tc. *hinc*.
[21] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *unicuique et*; the missing words are supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*a ciascuno essere apparecchiato*), by F. and subsequent editors, *u. esse paratam et*; T. *unicuique gratissimam et*; Tc. *uniuscujusque, et*.
[22] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *erate*; T. reads *oratae*; F.G.O. conjecturally, from Ital. (*di sperata*, v.l. *di desperata*), *speratae*; Tc. *speratae*; the reading of our MS. is an obvious error for *insperate*.
[23] *Sic*; an alternative reading is written above, but is illegible; Vat. *primitias*; so Tc.; Ital. *primizie*.

(31) degustare. Euigilare[1] igit*ur* om*n*es *et* assurgite regi ue*st*ro i*n*cole latiales[2] [fol. 143ro] non solu*m* sibi ad imp*er*ium set ut liberi / ad rengnu*m*[3] rese*r*uati.

[§ 7.] n*ec* t*amen*[4] (2) ut assurgatis exortor / set ut illius obstupescatis aspetu*m* qui (3) bibitis fluenta eius ei*usque* ma*r*ia nauigatis / qui calcatis arenas (4) littor*um* *et* alpium su*m*mitates / sue q*ue* sunt[5] / qui pu*bl*icis qu*i*buscu*mque* gau-(5)-detis *et* res pr*i*uatas ui*n*culo sue legis no*n* alit*er* p*re*sidetis[6]. Nollite (6) uelud ingn*a*ri decip*er*e uos met ipsos / tanq*uam* sopni*a*ntes[7] *in* cordibus (7) et dice*n*tes[8] do*m*in*um* non h*a*bemus / ortus enim eius et lacus est (8) q*uod* celum circuit. Num[9] dei est mare *et* ipse fecit illud *et* arrida*m* (9) fundauer*un*t manus e*i*us / num[10] deum principe*m*[11] p*re*destinasse re-(10)-lucet *in* miris effectibus. Et[12] uerbo uerbi *con*firmasse p*ro*fitetu*r*[13] (11) ecc*l*esi*a*.

[§ 8.] nempe si a creatura mu*n*di inuisibilia dei p*er* ea que *fac*ta (12) su*n*t rellitta[14] *con*spitiu*n*tur / et si ex nutioribu*s*[15] nobis innotiora simp*l*ic-(13)-*iter*[16] it*er* est[17] humane app*r*eh*e*nsioni / ut[18] *per* motu*m* celi motore*m* intelligimus[19] (14) *et* eius uelle / facile p*re*destinatio hec *etiam*[20] leuit*er* innotescat[21]. Nam (15) si a prima sintillula hui*us* ingnis[22] reuoluamus p*re*t*er*ita ex quo (16) sc*ilicet* argis[23] hospitalitas / est a frigibus denegata[24] / *et* usq*ue* ad optauiani[25] (17) triumphos mu*n*di gesta reuisere uacet[26] / no*n* nulla[27] eor*um* uidebim*us* (18) humane uirtutis o*m*nino culmina trascendisse[28] / *et* deum p*er* hom*in*es tanq*uam* (19)

[1] *Sic*; Vat. *Euigilate.*

[2] Hiatus in Vat., which omits *incole latiales*; the missing words are supplied, conjecturally from Ital. (*o abitatori d' Italia*), by T. and subsequent editors, *incolae Italiae*; Tc. leaves hiatus.

[3] Vat. *regimen*; so Tc.; Ital. *reggimento.*

[4] Vat. *tantum*; Ital. *solamente.*

[5] Tc. *quae sunt suae.*

[6] *Sic*; above is written, *alias possidetis*; Vat. *possidetis*; so Tc.; Ital. *possedete.*

[7] *Sic*; Vat. *somniantes*; so Tc.

[8] Tc. *in cordibus vestris dicentes.*

[9] Vat. *nam*; so Tc.; Ital. *Or non è...?*

[10] Vat. *unde*; so Tc.; Ital. *Non riluce...?*

[11] Vat. *romanum principem*; so Tc.; Ital. *il romano principe.*

[12] Tc. *verum.*

[13] Vat. *propreerius profitetur*; Tc.T.F.G.O. *posterius p.*; Ital. *confessa...essere poscia* (v.l. *posto e*) *confermato.*

[14] *Sic*; Vat. *intellecta*; so Tc.

[15] *Sic*; above is written, *alias notioribus*; Vat. *notioribus*; so Tc.

[16] So also Vat.; Tc.T.F.G.O. *similiter.*

[17] *Sic*; Vat. *interest*; so Tc.; Ital. *egli s' appartiene.*

[18] Vat. *ne*; Tc. *ut*; Ital. *sicchè.*

[19] Vat. *intelligamus*; so Tc.; Ital. *conosciamo.*

[20] Tc. *vel.*

[21] Vat. *intuentibus innotescat*; Tc.T.F.G.O. *i. innotescet*; Ital. *agli adguardatori* (v.l. *auguratori*) *sieno* (v.l. *fieno*) *chiari.*

[22] Vat. *a prima huius ignis*; T. *a prima hujus origine*; F.G.O. conjecturally, from Ital. (*dalla prima favilla di questo fuoco*), *a prima hujus ignis favilla*; Tc. *a prima favilla hujus ignis.*

[23] Tc. *scilicet et Argis.*

[24] Vat. *deregata*; T. *derogata*; Tc.F.O. *denegata*; Ital. *negata.*

[25] *Sic*; Vat. *octauianj*; so Tc.

[26] Tc. *vacat.*

[27] Vat. omits *non*; Ital. *molte cose.*

[28] *Sic*; so Tc.; Vat. *transcendisse.*

celos[1] nouos / aliquid operatum fuisse / non et enim[2] / semper nos agimus / (20) quin[3] interdum uteusilia[4] dei sumus / ac[5] uoluntates humane quibus (21) inest ex natura liberata[6] / etiam[7] inferioris affectus immunes quandoque aguntur / (22) et obnocxie uoluntati eterne / sepe illi ancillantur ingnare /

[§ 9.] *et* si hec (23) que uti[8] principia sunt adprobandum[9] quod queritur non suffitiunt quis non ab (24) illata conclusione[10] per talia precedentia mecum[11] oppinari cogetur. Pace[12] uide-(25)-licet annorum[13] orbem totaliter amplecxata. que[14] sui sillogizantis fa-(26)-tiem[15] dei filium[16] sicuti opere patrato ostendit[17]. Et hic cum ad reuel-(27)-lationem spiritus homo factus euangelizaret in terris quasi diruens[18] duo rengna / (28) sibi *et* cesari uniuersa distribuens / alterutri iussit[19] reddi que sua (29) sunt.

[§ 10.] quod[20] si pertimax[21] animus[22] poscit ulterius non dum annuens ueritati (30) uerba christi examinet. etiam[23] iam negati / cui cum potestatem suam pillatus obiceret (31) lux nostra de sursum esse asseruit quod ille iactabat / qui cesaris ibi auctoritate [fol. 143vo] uicarie[24] gerebat offitium. Non igitur ambuletis sicut *et* gentes (2) ambulant in uanitate sensus tenebris obscurati / set apperite (3) oculos mentis uestre ac uidete quoniam regem nobis celi *et* terre dominus ordi-(4)-nauit. Hic est quem petrus dei uicarius honorificare nos mo-(5)-net / quem clemens nunc petri subcessor / luce apostolice benedictionis (6) inluminat ut ubi radius spiritualis non suffiçit / ibi splen-(7)-dor minoris luminaris[25] inlustret.

[1] Vat. *per celos*; so Tc.
[2] Vat. *non eterni*; Tc. *non etenim*; Ital. *in verità non sempre mai.*
[3] Tc. *quouiam.*
[4] *Sic*; Vat. *utensilia*; so Tc.; Ital. *fatture.*
[5] Tc. *et.*
[6] Vat. *libertas*; so Tc.; Ital. *la libertade.*
[7] Tc. *ut.*
[8] Vat. *ubi*; Tc. *uti*; Ital. *siccome.*
[9] Vat. *ad probandum*; so Tc.; Ital. *a provare.*
[10] Tc. *ad illatam conclusionem.*
[11] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *precedeutia cum*; Tc. leaves hiatus, but punctuates *praecedentia..., cum*; and conjectures 'forsan: accedet,' the blank is filled conjecturally by T. *ita mecum*; F.G.O. *nobiscum.*
[12] Tc. *iu pace.*
[13] Vat. *annorum duodecim*; so Tc.; Ital. *dodici anni.*
[14] Tc. *qua.*
[15] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *silogiza fatiem*; Tc.T.F.G.O. conjecturally, from Ital. (*del suo sillogizzatore*), *syllogizatoris f.*
[16] Tc. *filius.*
[17] Vat. *ostenditur*; so Tc.; Ital. *dimostra.*
[18] *Sic*; Vat. *dirimens*; so Tc.; Ital. *dividendo.*
[19] Vat. *duxit*; Tc.T.G.O. *dixit*; Ital. *commandò.*
[20] Tc. *Quare.*
[21] *Sic*; above is written *alias pertinax.*
[22] Tc. *aliquis*; Ital. *animo.*
[23] Tc. *tum.*
[24] Vat. *a. vicaria*; so Tc.; Ital. *per vicaria autorità.*
[25] Tc. *luminis*; Ital. *lume.*

Proposed emendations[1] *in the Oxford text of Epist.* V.

l. 3. *For* albam, *read* (*with MS.*) ab ortu Auroram[2].

l. 11. *For* quasi ut heliotropium, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) quasi heliotropium[3].

l. 44. *For* initiis, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) initis[4].

l. 59. *For* illudens, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) alludens[5].

l. 63. *For* psalterio, *read* (*with MS.*) in psalterio[6].

l. 76. *For* neve resiliat, *read* (*with MS.*) non resiliat[7].

ll. 92—3. *For* libentius vero ejus miseretur, *read* (*with MS.*) sed ei voluptuosius miseretur[8].

l. 95. *For* plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur, *read* (*with MS.*) plerumque supinatur ut coluber et vertitur[8].

ll. 97—8. *For* unicuique esse paratam et speratae laetitiae, *read* (*with MS.*) unicuique praeparari et insperatae[9] laetitiae[8].

l. 100. *For* incolae Italiae, *read* (*with MS.*) incolae Latiales[8].

[1] In addition to, or in substitution of, the emendations proposed in my previous article (see *M.L.R.* VII, 38—9).

[2] This reading is confirmed by the Italian *da Oriente l' Aurora*.

[3] The sense would be the same, but there is no authority for the interpolated *ut*. There is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of *heliotropium* here. Some read 'quasi ad heliotropium,' and take it to refer to the winter solstice; but there is no authority for this reading, and none that I can discover for this interpretation. The Italian translator gives no help; his rendering, 'al termine della retrogradazione,' seems also to point to an astronomical interpretation. but it is difficult to see what connection the retrogression of the planets can have with the context. Others think the reference is to the plant, otherwise known as *solsequium*, 'turnsole'; but the expression *hebetata*, 'dulled,' 'dimmed,' hardly seems appropriate as applied to a plant. I think Dante must have had in mind the gem *heliotropium* or *heliotropia*, whose properties when exposed to the sun in certain conditions are described in the old lapidaries, and in the medieval dictionaries of Papias, Uguccione da Pisa, and Giovanni da Genova. In the absence of the sun ('sine sole') the stone would naturally lose its peculiar properties, and would appropriately be described as *hebetata*, a term applied by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* XXXVII, 5, 18) to a species of emerald, which was said to be deprived of its brilliancy by exposure to the sun ('in sole hebetari'). It will be remembered that Dante refers in the *Commedia* to another reputed property of the gem heliotrope, that of rendering its wearer invisible (*Inf.* XXIV, 93: 'Senza sperar pertugio o eliotropia').

[4] I had previously proposed to read *initibus* with Torricelli, supposing his reading to have MS. authority; but as this proves not to be the case, and as both MSS. agree, *initis* (from neut. plur. *inita* used as substantive) is to be preferred. This reading receives indirect support from the Italian translation, in which the wholly irrelevant words 'dolce e piano' occur. I was puzzled to account for the insertion of this phrase, until it occurred to me that it is no doubt the translator's rendering of *mitis*, either his own, or a copyist's, misreading of the *initis* of the Latin original.

[5] Giovanni da Genova in the *Catholicon* says, 'est *alludere illudere*.'

[6] This is supported by *Psalm* XCIV, 2 in the Vulgate (of which Dante's words are a reminiscence): 'Praeoccupemus faciem ejus in confessione: et in psalmis jubilemus ei'; and by the Italian *nel saltero*.

[7] I had previously proposed to read (with Vat. and Torricelli) *non resiliet*; but the subjunctive *resiliat*, as read by our MS., and supported by the Ital. (*nè torni indietro*), seems preferable.

[8] In confirmation of Barbi; see previous article, *loc. cit.* p. 35 n. 16, p. 36 nn. 1, 4, 5, 6.

[9] MS. *insperare*, for *insperate*.

l. 123. *For* similiter, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) simpliciter.

ll. 127—8. *For* a prima huius ignis favilla, *read* (*with MS.*) a prima scintillula huius ignis.

l. 129. *For* Argis hospitalitas...denegata, *read* Argis hospitalitas... derogata[1].

[1] In spite of the evidence of our MS. in favour of *denegata*, I still prefer *derogata*, on the grounds stated in my previous article (*loc. cit.* p. 38 n. 11). As to the required sense of *derogare*, Papias gives as synonyms (under *detractare*), *derogare*, *dedignari*, *temnere*, and (under *derogare*), *detrahere* (which is a synonym of *laedere*). For Dante's use of the word in a somewhat similar sense, cf. *Mon.* III, 3, l. 58; and *Epist.* IX, l. 43. In the note on this passage in my previous article I referred to Wicksteed's suggestion as to the allusion being to the repulse of the Argonauts from the Simoïs by Laomedon, and the subsequent reprisals of the Greeks; and, accepting his translation of *Argis* ('to the Argives'), I spoke of 'the denial of hospitality *to the Greeks* by the Trojans.' But *Argi*, of course, properly means not 'Argives' but 'Argos,' as Dante must have known from its frequent occurrence in the *Aeneid* (cf. I, 24, 285; II, 178; VII, 286; X, 779, 782) and *Thebaid*, and from the commentary of Servius on *Aeneid* I, 24, where it is stated: '*Argos* in numero singulari generis neutri est, ut Horatius *Argos dicit equis Argos ditesque Mycenas*. In plurali vero masculini, *hi Argi*. Caeterum derivatio nominis *Argivos* facit, non *Argos*.' He might also have known this from the *Catholicon*, where Giovanni da Genova says: '*Argi*, masculini generis in plurali, nomen loci.' But if *Argi* be taken here in its classical sense of 'Argos,' and if the allusion be, as I suppose, to the great 'historical' landmark, the rape of Helen, we are confronted by the difficulty that Helen, as Dante must have been well aware, was abducted not from Argos, but from Sparta. For my supposition to be tenable, it must be assumed therefore, either that Dante here uses Argos, not to indicate the town of Argos, but, in the wider sense, of Greece, as in *Aeneid* II, 95, in which case *Argis* would be a locative, 'in Greece'; or that he held that *Argi* might also be used as the equivalent of *Argivi*, the descendants of Argus (just as he uses *Turni* in *Epist.* VII, l. 98 for the Rutulians, the followers of Turnus). There is evidence to show that *Argi* was interpreted as *Argivi* in late and medieval Latin. The compilers of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (in course of publication at Leipzig) quote from the commentary of the pseudo-Fulgentius on the *Thebaid* the following: 'Argeos grece, providentia latine, unde Greci dicuntur Argi, id est providi.' To which I may add the much more important testimony of Papias in his *Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum* (c. 1060): '*Argi* graece et *argiui* dicti ab argo rege filio apis. Iidem *danai* a danao rege. Iidem quoque *argolici* ab argo'; and of Uguccione da Pisa in his *Magnae Derivationes* (c. 1200): '*Argos* nomen civitatis in Grecia, neutri generis et indeclinabile in singulari, sed in plurali masculini generis, et declinatur *Argi-orum*, unde dicti sunt *Argi*, vel ab *Argo* rege dicuntur.' This interpretation of *Argi* as *Argivi* would be due no doubt to the misunderstanding of such a statement as that of St Augustine in the *De Civitate Dei* (a work familiar to Dante): 'Apis rex Argivorum mortuus est in Aegypto. Huic filius Argus successit in regnum, ex cuius nomine et Argi et ex hoc Argivi appellati sunt' (XVIII, 6)—a passage which is actually quoted in the German *Thesaurus* as evidence of the use of *Argi* in the sense of *Argivi**. It may further be noted (on the authority of the *Thesaurus*) that in the passage from the commentary of Servius quoted above there is an alternative reading 'Argivus facit *et* Argus.' It is quite conceivable, therefore, that Dante may have *bona fide* used *Argi* in the sense of *Argivi*, while aware of the fact that in Virgil and Statius it stood for Argos. If *denegata* be read, and the allusion to the comparatively obscure episode of the repulse of the Greeks by Laomedon (mentioned by Dares Phrygius, *De Excidio Trojae*, cap. ii, and repeated by Brunetto Latini in his *Trésor*, I, 32) be accepted, then 'Argis' *must* be taken as equivalent to 'Argivis,' as by the author of the early Italian translation ('a' Greci') and by all subsequent translators, Italian, English, and German.

* That St Augustine uses *Argi* in the sense of 'Argos' here ('from *Argus* the city got its name *Argi*, and from *Argi* the *Argivi* were so called') is evident from a passage in the very next chapter: 'Argis adhuc manente Argo, mortuus est Joseph in Aegypto' (XVIII, 7). When he speaks of the people, he calls them *Argivi*: 'Hoc (*sc.* Argo) regnante apud Argivos...mortuus est Jacob in Aegypto' (XVIII, 6; cf. XVIII, 3, 4, 5, 8, etc.).

l. 145. *For* nobiscum, *read* (*with MS.*) mecum.

l. 148. *For* syllogizatoris, *read* (*with MS.*) syllogizantis[1].

In a subsequent number of the *Review* I hope to print a third article, giving a transcript of the Venetian text (*Cod. Marc. Lat.* XIV, 115) of Dante's letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII), thus completing the series of transcripts of the three known MSS. of the Latin text of this letter.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

*** *Addenda to previous article.*—In *Epist.* II, § 1, l. 8, where the Vatican MS. (the only MS. in which this letter has been preserved) reads 'dignis premiis *me netatur*,' all the editors have adopted the emendation *muneratur* made (*sub silentio*) by Torri. Some such word is obviously required by the sense. Dr Heberden has suggested to me that the more likely word is *remuneratur*. He points out that Dante nowhere uses the word *munerare*, but twice uses *remunerare*; e.g. in *Epist.* I, § 2, l. 43, where it is associated, as is the verb in the present passage, with *praemia digna*: 'si qua coelo est pietas quae talia remuneranda prospiciat, illa vobis praemia digna ferat'; and in *Mon.* II, 8, l. 94. Further, Dante uses *remuneratio* in *Epist.* X, § 30, l. 590. The longer word has also in its favour the fact that it would account for the gap in the MS. reading, which no doubt in the copy from which the Vatican MS. was transcribed had been obscured by a blot or erasure.

To the list of proposed emendations in the Oxford text of this letter printed in the previous article (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, VII, 26) should therefore be added:

l. 8. *For* muneratur, *read* remuneratur.

* * * *

The following emendation (omitted by an oversight in the previous article[2]) in the text of *Epist.* VI, should also be added:

l. 142. *For* quantum, *read* (*with MS.*) quam.

And the following addition should be made to the note[3] on *Epist.* I, l. 24:—'The verb *pollucere* is used by Dante himself elsewhere, viz. in

[1] I had previously proposed to read *qua sui syllogizatoris facies, Dei filius...ostenditur* (see previous article, *loc. cit.* p. 39, n. 1), the reading of Torricelli, but the *ostendit* of our MS. (supported by the Ital. *dimostra*) renders my suggested emendation of the Oxford text superfluous.

[2] *M.L.R.* VII, 19.

[3] *M.L.R.* VII, 31 n. 3.

the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, II, 1, l. 13: "ordine pertractantes illo quem in fine primi libri polluximus"—where for *polluximus*, which he apparently did not understand, Giuliani *sub silentio* substituted *polliciti sumus*, just as here the editors have substituted *pollicetur* for *polluxit*.'

* * * *

Since the above article was written my attention has been directed to the edition of Dante's letters issued recently at Florence by G. C. Sansoni, under the editorship of G. L. Passerini (*Le Opere Minori di Dante Alighieri, novamente annotate da* G. L. Passerini.—VI. *Le Epistole e la Disputa interno all'Acqua e alla Terra.* Firenze, MCMX.). Passerini's text is that of the Oxford Dante, 'con qualche miglioramento.' The divergences from the Oxford text, in the letters which have been dealt with in these two articles, are about a dozen in number, exclusive of misprints, of which there are several somewhat serious ones[1]. Whether all the alterations are 'miglioramenti' is a matter of opinion. Passerini adopts (without acknowledgment) Novati's proposed emendations (recorded in my previous article) in *Epist.* I (l. 27, *ruebant* for *rubebant*), and *Epist.* VI (l. 143, *retes* for *pedes*). In *Epist.* III, l. 2, he reads *quam affectus gratuitas dominantis*, where O. reads *quem a. gratitudinis dominantur* (MS. *quam a. gratuitatis dominantis*); in l. 5, he reads (with MS.) *negligentem*, where O. reads *negligenter*; in l. 7, he reads (with MS.) *oraculi*, where O. reads *oratiunculae*; in l. 19, he reads (with MS.) *diurnis*, where O. reads *divinis*; he ignores, in l. 16, the correction *forma* for *fortunae*, to which Novati drew attention (see *Dante e la Lunigiana*, pp. 530—1). In *Epist.* V, l. 50, he reads *Langobardorum* for *Longobardorum* (the reading of both MSS.); in l. 76, he reads *ne resiliat*, where O. reads *neve resiliat* (Vat. *non resiliet*; Pant. *non resiliat*); in ll. 92—3, and 97, he adopts (without acknowledgment) the readings of the S. Pantaleo MS. recorded by Barbi (in *Bull. Soc. Dant.* N.S. II, 23 n.); while he ignores Barbi's corrections, from the same MS., of the

[1] For instance, p. 34, l. 71, *mentes* for *mentis*; p. 38, l. 125, *resolvamus* for *revolvamus*; p. 70, l. 93, *est* is omitted; p. 72, l. 111, *quoad* for *quod*; p. 72, l. 112, *ut* is omitted. There are other misprints in the text of the letters, of less consequence, on p. 50, l. 69; p. 60, ll. 193—4; p. 62, l. 7; p. 68, l. 77; p. 72, l. 122; p. 74, ll. 135, 149, 153. We feel bound to protest against the editor's disregard of his responsibilities in this and other respects. The volume abounds with careless misprints. There are no less than eleven in the text of the three short Battifolle letters, one of them (*familiater* for *familiariter*) being actually reproduced from Torri's text. Further, the editor is culpably reckless in some of his statements. For example, he asserts (p. 192) that *Epist.* X (to Can Grande) is one of the three letters mentioned by Villani, which, as the editor of the *Giornale Dantesco* ought to know, is not the fact. Again, we are told (p. 195) that the last *four* letters in the volume were addressed to Margaret of Brabant, among these four being the apocryphal letter in Italian to Guido da Polenta! Also, it is stated (p. 186) that the text of *Epist.* VIII was first printed by Witte in 1826, whereas Witte's edition of Dante's letters did not appear until the following year.

conjectural readings in ll. 95, 97—8. In *Epist.* VII, ll. 111—12, he omits (presumably as a gloss, on the authority of Witte) the words *quae quidem et Amalech et Agag sonare dicuntur*, which are in all three MSS., and which are an essential part of the text, as has already been shown (see *M. L. R.* VII, 9, n. 16). In *Epist.* VI, l. 169, he ignores the correction *punita* for *Punica* (see *Bull. Soc. Dant.* N. S. XIII, 267 n.); and in the title of *Epist.* I he ignores Del Lungo's correction *Marchia Tervisina* for *Maritima, terris* (see *Dino Compagni e la sua Cronica*, II, 587 n.).

T.

LYDGATE'S VERSES ON QUEEN MARGARET'S ENTRY INTO LONDON.

ALTHOUGH John Stow recorded the fact that Lydgate made verses for the pageants at Queen Margaret's Entry into London in 1445, no copy of them has been known to students of Lydgate. Even Dr MacCracken, who has expended so much research in collecting the poems of the Monk of Bury, has recently declared that these verses have not survived[1]. It is a pleasant surprise, therefore, to find the 'lost' poem in MS. Harl. 3869, immediately preceding the *Confessio Amantis*, which occupies the remainder of the manuscript. Though written in a different hand from the *Confessio*, the Lydgate poem does not appear to be a later addition. Indeed, the fact that it stands upon leaves which make up part of the first gathering (which includes also the beginning of Gower's poem) makes it impossible to suppose that it was at any time a separate leaflet.

Though one finds no ascription of these verses to Lydgate in the MS., the evidence of style is, I think, conclusive. Moreover they correspond closely to the account of Lydgate's verses given by Stow. At the top of the page (fol. 2[a]) on which the verses begin a late sixteenth century hand has noted the occasion for which they were designed. A portion of this superscription has been trimmed away by the binder. What remains reads as follows:

> 1445. ye 28 of may Quene margaret.....
> the Citie of london.

I give herewith the text of the verses, together with the extremely interesting headings, marking the places at which they were to be spoken:

[1] *Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, Part I, EETS. 1911, p. xl.

(fol. 2ᵃ) **Atte the Brigge foot in Suthwerke | Pees and plente.**
Ingredimini et replete terram.

|| Mooſt criſten Princeſſe | by influence of grace
Doughter of Iheru*ſ*alem[1] | oure pleſaunce
And ioie | Welcome as euere p*r*inceſſe was
With hert entier | and hool affiaunce
Cauſer of Welth | ioie and abundaunce
Youre Cite youre poeple | youre ſubgites alle
with herte with worde with dede.[2]
Welcome | welcome | welcome vn to you calle

|| At Noes Shippe vpon the brigge.
|| Iam non vltra irafcar ſuper terram.

|| So truſteth youre Poeple | with affiaunce
Through youre grace | and highe benignite
Twixt the Reawmes two | Englande and ffraunce
Pees ſhal approche | Reſt and vnite
Mars ſette a side | with alle hys cruelte
Whiche to longe | hath troubled the Reawmes tweyne
Bydynge youre Coumfort | in this aduerſite
Mooſt criſten Princeſſe | oure lady ſouereyne

|| Mooſt criſten Princeſſe | oure lady ſouereyne
Right as whilom | by goddes myght and grace
Noe this Arke | didde forge and ordeyne
Where in he and hys | myght eſcape and paſſe
The flood of vengeaunce | cauſed by treſpaſſe
Conueied aboute | as god liſte hym to gye
By moiean of mercy | founde a reſtyng place
After the flood | vppon this armonie.

|| Vn to the Doue | that brought the braunche of pees
Reſemblynge youre ſympleneſſe columbyne
power colu*m*byne
Tokyn and ſigne | the floode ſhulde ceſſe.
Conducte by grace | and pure diuine

[1] An allusion to the fact that Margaret's father was 'King of Jerusalem.' So Wm. of Worcester refers to her as 'filiam Regis Neapolis, Ceciliae et Jerusalem' (*Annales Rer. Anglic.*, Ed. Hearne, II, 462).
[2] Interlined by the same hand.

Sonne of Comfort | gynneth faire to ſhyne
By youre preſence | wherto we synge and seyne
Welcome of ioie | right extendet lyne
Mooſt criſten Princeſſe | oure lady ſouereyne

|| Now at Draught Brigge.

(fol. 2^b) [At bottom of fol. 2^a and top of fol. 2^b sixteen lines' space has been left blank.]

|| At leden halle. || Madame grace Chauncelere de dieu.

||| Oure benigne princeſſe | and lady ſouereyne
Grace conueie you forthe | and be youre gide
In good life longe | proſperouſly to Reyne
Trouth and mercy | to gedre ben allied
Juſtice and Pees | theſe Suſtres ſchal prouide
Twixt Reawmes tweyn̄. ſtedfaſt loue to ſette
God and grace | the p*ar*ties han applied (?)
Now the Suſtres | haue hem kiſte and mette

|| Prenoſtike of pees | ferme and infenite
Dame grace | goddes vicarie generalle
ffoure patentes | faire | freſſh and legible
Conteynyng .iiij. preceptes | imp*e*rialle
Sealles impreſſed for memorialle
To these Suſtres foure | thus be directe
Whiche as Mynyſtres | further p*ro*clamen ſhalle
Tencreſen pees | werres to correcte.

|| Clergie knyghthode | the lawes co*m*mendable
Affentyng alle this matere | to ratefie
Conſeile of grace | haldyng ferme and ſtable
George and Dioniſe | for here poeple crie
Vppon the lorde | that alle ſchall iuſtefie
This tyme of grace | thus wolde the ſtorie ſeyne
Trustynge that pees | ſchall floure and fructifie
By you Prynceſſe | and lady ſouereyne

|| At the Tonne in Cornehille.

|| Aungeles of pees | ſhall haue dominacioun
Sentence yeuen | from the heuenes highe
(fol. 3[a]) Siewed by grace | and good mediacioun
Pees graunted | to growe and multeplie
Exiled thangeles of wrecched tirannye
Werre proſcribed | pees ſhal haue hys place
Bleſſide be Margarete | makyng this purchace

|| Conueie of grace. Virgyne mooſt benigne.
Oo bleſſid martir | holy margarete
Maugre the myght | of ſpirites maligne
To god aboue | hire praier pure and ſwete
Maketh now for Reſt | pees and quiete
Shewed here pleynly | in this ſtorie
Oure queene Margarete | to ſignifie

|| God in heuene | comaundynge abſtinence
Noo wicked Aungel | ſchall do more greuaunce
Erthe See | and Trees ſhall ben in exiſtence
Obeiſaunt to mannes wille | and pleſaunce
Deſired pees | bitwixt Englande and ffraunce
This tyme of grace | by mene of Magarete
We triſte to god | to lyuen in quiete

|| At the grete Conduite in chepe.

|| Grace in this lyf | and aftirwarde glorie
Dauid in the pſalme | he ſaith thus expreſſe
How pleſaunt be | thy tabernacles highe
lorde he ſaith | this pſalme by ſhort proceſſe
Of oure lorde concludeth | high goodneſſe
Nooman to lacke reward | when he goth hens
That lyueth here | in parfite innocens

|| Enſaumpled pleynly | by faire parable
Ten virgynes | ayens the ſpouſe they yede
ffyue necligent refuſed | founde vnable
And of the Spouſe | fyue prudent had mede
ffor contynence in thoght | worde and dede
Noo mannes laude | ſechynge in thaire entent
To serue the ſpouſe | hire hertes onely brent

|| The Spouſe is fought | ſponſus with hire is mette
After laboure | he wille ſhe take hire reſt
(fol. 3[b]) So moche he hathe | hys herte vppon hire ſette
Now hath the Turtle | founde a pleſaunt Neſt
Cōme on ſhe ſaith | I wil yeue the my breſt
Who ſeketh Reſt | with feithfull trewe corage
Shalle dwelle atte laſt | in goddes heritage.

|| Sponſus pees | the Kynge will make hys ffeſte
Alle thyng is redy | plentie and suffiſaunce
Praied for to come | geſtes mooſt and leſte
Vn to the Spouſes | full of heuenly purueaunce
Milke and honye | flowyng in habundaunce
Aboute the londe | whither he hath vs brought
Right ferre and wide | geſtes clept and ſought

|| Eteth and dryncketh | my ffrendes of the beſte
Mooſt chered frendes | dryncketh inwardly
After the ffeſte | take ye youre Reſte
Thus ſeithe the Spouſe | hys ffeſte to magnifie
This ioious Canticle | dothe ſignifie
A pees ſhall be | where as now trouble is
After this lyfe | endely in blys.

|| At the Croſſe in Chepe

|| Sacris ſolempnijs iuncta ſunt gaudia. &c.

|| Oo blifful pſalme and ſong celeſtialle
Letatus ſum | for thynges that I here
Noon erthely ioie | compared nor egalle
May bēn here to this blys | may not diſpeire
But ſchyneth amydde | the heuenly ſpere
Thorient Sonne | that noon Eclipſe may fade
To goddes houſe | now ſchall we goo right glade

|| Many manſioun bilt in that paleis
Of that Cite | thynges Right glorioufe
Been ſaide | o lorde who can thy paleis preiſe
So is it faire | and inly ſpecioufe
All holyneſſe beſemeth | the lordes houſe
Sanctus is ſonge | in euery Ierarchie
Praiſyng the lorde | of eternall glorie

(fol. 4ᵃ) || Oo declared Prynceſſe | vn to youre noble grace
How god hath made | this conducte and conueye
Thus throgh youre Cite | from place to place
More hertly welcom̃ | then youre ſolk can ſeie
Enioieng entierly | youre highe nobleye
This pagent wold mene | youre excellence
That ther is ioie | in verrey exiſtence.

|| Where is reioiced | alle ſelicite
Withouten ende | eternally tendure
Contemplacioun | of the Deite
Which noon erthely langage | may diſcure
God behalden | of hys creature
Whiche aperteneth | to goſtly ſuffiſaunce
Whan from the worlde | is made diſſeueraunce.

|| ffrom vertu to vertu | men ſhall yp aſcende
Than ſhall god be ſeyn̄ | in the mount ſion̄
Thus you gide | vn to youre lyues ende
We praie the lorde | that gideth al[1] alloon̄
So that with yow | we may atteigne ecchon̄
To the ſaire Cite | of Iheruſalem.
Biſette aboute | with many a precious gemme

|| At Seynt Michaeles in Querne.

|| Aſſumpt aboue | the heuenly Ierarchie
Criſtes Modre | Virgyn̄ immaculate
God hys Tabernacle | to ſanctifie
Of Sterres .xij. the Croune hath preparate
Empriſe queene and ladie laureate
Praie for oure queene | that criſt[1] will here gouerne
Longe here on lyue | in hire noble aſtate
Aſtirward Crowne here | in bliſſe eterne

|| This ſtorie to youre highnes | wolde expreſſe
The grete Reſurecioun generall
Where of[1] oure feith | bereth pleyn̄ witneſſe
The ferefull ſowne | of Trumpe Iudiciall

[1] This word has been interlined by a different hand of about the same date.

(fol. 4ᵇ) Vppon the poeple | ẏ[t][1] fodeynly fhall calle.
Eche man to make a compte | and rekenynge
Right as hys conſciencie | be wreien fhalle
All be it Pope Emperour | or Kynge

|| Who hath wel doon̄ | to lyf predeſtinate
What ioie | what blis | how greet ffelicite
Vn to the ſaued of god | is ordinate
Noo tunge can telle | noon erthly igh may ſee
Ioie | laude Reſt | Pees | and *par*fite vnite
Triumphes of eternalle victorie
With fruicioun | of the Trynite
By contemplacioun | of hys glorie. Deo *gra*cias Amen.

Beside the text of these verses we may now place the account of them (referred to above) which Stow gives in his *Annales of England*. I quote from the edition of 1592[2]:—(p. 624) '... and so [Queen Margaret] was conueyed to the blacke heath, where shee was met by the maior, aldermen & sherifes of the citie in scarlet, & the crafts of the same, all riding on horsebacke, in blew gowns with brodered sleeues, and red hoods, on the 28. of Maie, who conueyed her with her train through Southwarke, and so through the city of London, then beautified with pageants of diuers histories, and other shews of welcome maruellous costly and sumptuous, which I ouerpasse, saue only to name a few. At the bridge foote toward Southwarke, a pageant of peace and plenty, *Ingredimini, & replete terram*, and certaine verses in English. Noes ship upon the bridge, *Iam non vltra irascar super terram*, verses in English. At Leden hall, madam Grace chancelor de Dieu, verses in English. At the tunne in Cornehill, of Saint Margaret verses in English. At the great conduit in Cheap of the 5. wise, & 5. foolish virgins, verses in English. At the crosse in Cheap, of the heauenly Jerusalem, verses. At Paules gate, of the generall resurrection and iudgement, with verses accordingly, all made by John Lydgate[3].'

Point by point Stow's statements tally with the text in Harl. 3869. One observes that they agree to the extent of supplying Latin mottoes for the first two pageants but omitting them in the case of the other

[1] This word has been interlined by a different hand of about the same date.
[2] No reference is made to them in the earlier edd. of Stow's 'Chronicle.'
[3] For the first half of the passage quoted Stow follows the phrases of Fabyan's chronicle, though correcting May 18—the date given by Fabyan—to May 28. But Fabyan breaks off his account of the pageants with the words, 'which I ouerpasse.' Stow lingers at this point 'only to name a few,' and it is to him alone that we are indebted for the details which follow.

four. Fortunately, in addition to Stow, we have a piece of contemporary testimony in the *Chronicle* of William Gregory, who in 1451 became Mayor of London. In all probability, therefore, Gregory was an eyewitness of the Queen's entry into the English capital. I quote merely that portion of his account which relates to our present concern:

'And a gayne hyr comynge to London were ordaynyde many notabylle devysys in the cytte, as at the brygge of London, and in othyr dyvers placys, at Ledynne halle, and in Cornehylle, and in iiij placys yn Chepe, that ys to say, at the Grete Condyte, and at the Standarde, and at the Crosse, and atte the Lytylle Condyte. And uppon Thorsday, the xxvj day of May, the Kyng made xlvj Knyghtys of the Bathe yn the Towre of London. And uppon the morowe, that was the Fryday, lordys of the realme, whythe nobylle and grete and costelowe araye, the Mayre of London and the aldyrmen in scharlet, whythe alle the craftys of London in blewe, wythe dyvers dyvysyngys, every crafte to be knowe from othyr, rydyng agayne Quene Margarete and brought hyr unto the Towre of London, the quene havynge whythe hyr xvij charys with ladys[1].' Gregory goes on to speak of the Queen's progress through London on the following day from the Tower to Westminster, but as he makes no reference to any pageant on this occasion, it is clear that the 'devysys' which he mentions were exhibited on Friday on her first entrance into the city.

A somewhat conflicting account of the ceremonies attending the Queen's reception is found in the *English Chronicle*. According to this account the Mayor, Aldermen and Commons met the Queen at Black Heath on Friday and conducted her to the Tower of London, where she rested that night. The pageants and 'devises' were shown on the following afternoon (Saturday) in the course of the Queen's progress from the Tower to Westminster. I quote merely the description of the pageants: 'And by þe wey, as she come þurgh þe Cite, there were shewed and made many devises and storyes, with angeles and oþer hevenly thinges, with songe and melody in dyuers places; and þe condites ran wyne, both white and rede, for all peple þat wold drynk[2].' In placing the pageants on Saturday, when the Queen made her progress through the City to Westminster, instead of placing them

[1] *Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the XV Cent.*, Ed. James Gairdner, Camden Soc. 1876, p. 186.

[2] *The Brut or English Chronicle*, Ed. F. Brie, EETS., 'Continuation F,' p. 489. The briefer account in 'Continuation G' (p. 510) contains nothing of importance for our purpose, though it may be worth noting that 'G' appears to be the source used by Fabyan.

on Friday, when she crossed the Thames and entered the City, the *English Chronicle* is certainly in error. For Saturday's procession started from the Tower and could not, therefore, have followed the route indicated by the Harl. MS.

In their account of the route taken by the Queen Gregory, Stow, and MS. Harl. 3869 are in complete agreement. The royal procession crossed the Thames by London bridge, and moved along Fish Street and Gracechurch Street to Leadenhall at the south-east corner of Gracechurch Street and Cornhill. Turning westward from this point, it passed through Cornhill and Cheapside (or 'West Cheap' as Stow calls it) to the gates of St Paul's. For the church of St Michael at Querne (mentioned in the Harl. MS.) and the Little Conduit[1] (mentioned by Gregory) both stood at the west end of Cheapside just opposite Paules gate (mentioned by Stow), so that the three are only different designations of the same spot.

The stations chosen for the exhibition of the pageants are those which would naturally have been selected. Leadenhall, one of Whittington's gifts to the City, was a favourite site for popular gatherings. Here were held the sports of the 'Lords of Misrule[2]'; here also the people were wont to assemble when serious business engaged their attention[3]. Half-way from Leadenhall to West Cheap stood The Tun—not, as its name might suggest, a tavern, but a prison for petty offenders. Here in 1401 a cistern had been built 'for sweet water conveyed by pipes of lead from Tiborne,' and here was set up a pair of stocks for 'night walkers[4].' Of the stations in 'Cheap' neither the Great Conduit[5] nor 'the Crosse in Chepe' requires comment[6]. Gregory's account makes mention of still another station in the progress through Cheap—'the Standarde,'—which was situated just half-way between the Great Conduit and Chepe Cross, at the same interval which separated the latter from Paules gate. The Standard was famous chiefly for the executions which took place there. It was the spot at which Wat Tyler beheaded several persons, and just five years after Margaret's entry into London it was also the scene of the execution of Lord Say by Jack Cade[7]. Such lugubrious associations, however, probably would not have counted seriously against the Standard

[1] 'The Conduit in West Cheape by Powles gate, was builded about the yeare 1442'—Stow, *Survay of London*, Ed. 1603, p. 17.
[2] *Survay of London*, p. 95.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 160.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 192.
[5] Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[6] The latter marked one of the stations of the bier of Queen Eleanor (*Survay of London*, p. 268).
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 267 f.

as a suitable place for a pageant in the Queen's honour. Our ancestors were more lighthearted than we in the presence of instruments of death. In any case it is difficult to set aside the express statement of Gregory, who was in all probability an eyewitness.

But if we follow Gregory we shall have to regard MS. Harl. 3869, which shows no verses at the Standard, as an incomplete text. Our suspicion that there may be omissions in this MS. is confirmed, moreover, by the blank space (sufficient for two stanzas) for verses to be spoken 'at Draught Brigge.' Evidently the scribe was aware in this case that his source was incomplete, and so left room for the insertion of the missing stanzas later. By the 'draught brigge' undoubtedly was meant the drawbridge at the northern end of London bridge[1]. Pageants were exhibited, therefore, at three points on the bridge: (1) at the Southwark end, (2) at the middle of the bridge (Noes shippe), (3) at the London end.

When we recognize the probable incompleteness of the text of Lydgate's verses preserved in the Harley MS., the close agreement of Stow's account with that manuscript becomes doubly significant. He is unable to add a single detail not found in this manuscript—except the tradition that the author of these verses was John Lydgate. The source of Stow's information, therefore, must have been a copy of these verses quite similar to that in Harl. 3869—if, indeed, we may not suspect that he had access to this identical manuscript.

Obviously Lydgate's verses served as a kind of introduction to the pageants themselves, commending them to the Queen's attention and assuring her of the loyal affection which they were designed to express. These pageants may very likely have been mummings such as were played on other occasions in the royal presence, to which, as we know, Lydgate repeatedly lent his literary talents. Into the question of these pageants, however, I do not wish here to enter, further than to remark that the one exhibited at Leadenhall evidently had as its theme the popular allegory of the Four Daughters of God which frequently made its appearance in the religious drama in both France and England[2].

Carleton Brown.

London.

[1] Cf. *Survay of London*, p. 25.
[2] Cf. Dr Hope Traver, *The Four Daughters of God*, Bryn Mawr Coll. Monograph, 1907.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

'Ralph Roister Doister' and 'The Wasps.'

Two passages in *Ralph Roister Doister* seem possibly to have been suggested by *The Wasps* of Aristophanes.

(1) In *Ralph Roister Doister*, III, iii, 80 (cf. v, vi, 22), Mathew Merygreeke, probably accompanying the last word with a stroke, says with one of his characteristic double meanings:

> Good night Roger olde knaue, knaue, knap.

Here the word *knap* seems to mean (i) boy, lad (O.E. *cnapa*), and to be a synonym of *knaue*; (ii) strike.

So, in *The Wasps*, 1307, Xanthias complains of Philocleon:

> κἄτυπτε δή με νεανικῶς, παῖ παῖ καλῶν,

where παῖ seems to be used with reference to a supposed etymological connexion with παίω.

(2) In *Ralph Roister Doister*, III, iii, 113, Mathew Merygreeke, practising Roister Doister in deportment, says:

> Ye must haue a portely bragge after your estate,

and again, l. 121,

> Then must ye stately goe, ietting vp and downe.

So, in a similar passage in *The Wasps*, 1168 f., where Bdelycleon is training his old father in the graces of fashionable life, he says:

> εἶτα πλουσίως
> ὠδὶ προβὰς τρυφερόν τι διασαλακώνισον.

W. H. Williams.

Hobart, Tasmania.

Notes on 'A Knack to Know an Honest Man.'

(*Malone Society Reprints*, 1910.)

Line 8 And hide them in the thicket from the Sunne,
That shine on Venus stately builded towers,...

Read 'shines on Venice.'

16 But though my mind in recolecting teares,
With horror dumbe, and eke would choke my tong
From telling tragike newes, I will begin.

'Teares' does not seem to be the right word. Its presence may be partially explained by reference to line 14, the last word of which is also 'teares.' But probably there was some similarity in the termination which helped to mislead the compositor. Perhaps we should read 'stares'?

31 Had Venus no other strumpet to content
Sempronios mind,...

For 'Venus' read 'Venice.'

68 Downe with the murtherers, fellowes kill his horse.

Seeing that the speaker certainly knows that there was only one slayer, I should correct to 'murtherer.'

337 Riches are baites to teach us nigardines,...

For 'nigardines' I should read 'nigardnes' as in line 1560—

And nygardnes was caught by sutteltie.

656 Go thou to beggerie, Ile to the butcherie,
The prouerbe is true that I tell to you,
Tis better to be dronken and drousie,
Than hunger starued and lousie.

For 'butcherie' read 'butterie.'

705 Make thou a marble rocke of this white breast,
Against the sea of euerie loued assault.

The editors suggest 'loue-assault.' I think 'lewd assault' is more in accord with the author's usage.

742 Yond come the pompious shew.

The editors place 'come' among their doubtful readings: but 'shew' must be taken as collective.

938 Rather then liue and see me banisht.

Here we should read 'banished'; as also in line 1233, though one must be careful in suggesting alteration of the verse in a play which is full of metrical experiment.

The situation in Scene viii is borrowed from the *Arcadia*.

992. The editors have not included among their irregular readings the s.d. '*Exit omnis*'; nor have they noted the unnecessary colon at the end of line 1004—

> And all the traine of twinckling starres adorne:
> The hollow compasse of our heauens spheare,...
> 1130 I pray thee hold my head.

To avoid ambiguity we must place a comma after 'hold.'

> 1162—63 I told you what would come out,
> He spake as though hee would spit his stomp in my mouth.

For 'out' we possibly should read 'ont,' and for 'stomp' perhaps 'tong.'

> 1233 I am not banisht, you wrong my fames?

See note on line 938. For 'my fames?' read 'me, sonnes.' I believe line 1232, to which this line is a reply, should be ascribed to one of Brishio's sons, and neither to *Brishio*, as in the text, nor to *Lelio*, as the editors suppose.

> 1254 Ashamd, I beg a pardon at thy handes,
> In rendring nature, that hath lost thy power,
> To breed such manslayers in an honest stocke.

Read 'Ingendring nature.'

> 1270 I vow to be as sequest to my Father,...

Read 'to be a free guest'?

> 1331 When as the greatest arts of our age,
> Can neuer make or hardely mend a man.

For 'arts' read 'artist' (*i.e.* physician or surgeon).

> 1356—60 We two deserue to die.
> *Releasing Zepherionio and Orphinio.*
> These prisoners haue done thee honor, for by wounding me
> They have preserud their sister from a rape,
> Me from perpetual shame, thee from much griefe:

According to the editors, the italicized words form part of the preceding line and are not a stage-direction. But the metre proves that this is an error. Properly arranged the verses must run—

> We two deserue to die. These prisoners
> Haue done thee honor, for by wounding me...
> 1392 How do your sighes reuiue my drouping minde?

For 'sighes' read 'sights.'

> 1433—36 *Ze.* Father, the Souldiers tending in his tent,
> Reports that he is gone to Venice,
> [*S*]*em.* Ha ha, midest all these melancolly griefes.
> And with resolued minde to end his daies.

The editors note as irregular the comma after Venice, and consider that 1435—36 are 'out of place unless the lines belong to Brishio.' The comma is quite correct, and only line 1435 is misplaced. It is printed as the first line on the verso of G 2. Looking at the tops of the other pages which were set in the same forme, we see that it ought to have appeared as the first line of the verso of G 4. Here, after a sudden and unexpected turn of fortune, Sempronio makes a characteristic comment—

> *Du*, Then do the Senate presently decree,
> That Lucida shall have the promist coine,
> And Seruio for breaking of the law,
> Shallbe imprisoned for a twelve-month space.
> [*Sem.* Ha ha, midest all these melancolly griefes]
> This pretty accident doth make me laugh.

1459—61 Stay, stay my sonnes, leaue me some comfort in my age:
Whether wilt thou transport my zealous minde,
Let me surfeit in the sinne of loue:

The editors surmise that something has been lost before 1460. More likely we should read 'me, zealous minde.'

1606 Fit we to censure wrongs done to our selues,...

Should this not be—

Sit we to censure wrongs done to our selues?

1680—82 We thus conclude,
That Brishio shall be free from his supposed exile:
and inioy the goods and fortune he inioyd before,...

Read—

We thus conclude, that Brishio shall be free
From his supposed exile, and inioy
The goods and fortune he inioyd before.

1703 Since none but Experience
Hath power to cut off vertues noble head,
Thou shalt not die.

Read '[Penitent] Experience,' the name assumed by the disguised Sempronio.

1717 Old Sempronio now is young againe,
And dead Sempronio now doth liue,...

Read 'liue [againe].'

1735 my fatall wounds,
Which when I eyed Annetta, I haue wept,...

Insert a comma after 'eyed.'

J. Le Gay Brereton.

Sydney.

Two Notes on 'The Merry Wives of Windsor.'

IV, ii, 46—48.

When Falstaff is caught the second time at Master Ford's house, he exclaims:

> What shall I do?—I'll creep into the chimney.

To which Mrs Ford replies:

> There they always use to discharge their birding-pieces. Creep into the kiln-hole.

It does not concern us here whether the words, 'Creep into the kiln-hole,' really belong to Mrs Page, as Malone conjectured, or not. Many a reader, however, must have been puzzled to know why Master Ford and his brothers should have been in the habit of discharging their guns up the chimney. The only commentator who explains the passage correctly, as far as I have been able to discover, is the late H. C. Hart, who in his edition (1904) of the play in the Arden Shakespeare has the following note to these lines:

'As lately as half a century ago (and perhaps still in some places) it was a common practice in some parts of Ireland, from olden times, to discharge a fowling-piece up the chimney to bring down the soot in gentlemen's houses. I have seen no suggestion as to the sense of Mrs Ford's remark, but this is perhaps what she refers to.'

The purpose of the present note is to point out that the existence in Elizabethan England of the custom which Hart mentions is confirmed by a scene in Middleton and Rowley's *Changeling*, V, 1, which the editors of Shakespeare have overlooked but which makes clear, I think, the passage in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In Middleton and Rowley's play, De Flores, plotting against the life of Diaphanta, the maid of Beatrice, says to the latter (according to the 1653 Quarto, Vol. VI, p. 94 of A. H. Bullen's edition, 8 vols., London, 1885–6),

> I will be ready with a piece high-charg'd
> As 'twere to cleanse the chimney: there 'tis proper now,
> But she shall be the mark.

Accordingly a few lines later on we have the stage-direction: 'Enter Deflores with a piece' [i.e. gun] (Quarto of 1653), whereupon Vermandero asks him: 'Knave whither goes that piece?' and De Flores replies: 'To scour the chimney.'

IV, v, 69—72.

In the affair in which the Host is robbed of his horses Sir Hugh Evans says to that worthy:

> Have a care of your entertainments: there is a friend of mine come to town, tells me there is three cozen-germans that has cozened all the hosts of Readins, of Maidenhead, of Colebrook, of horses and money, etc.

The Quarto of 1602 (see W. W. Greg's edition, Clarendon Press, 1910, p. 48), however, gives Sir Hugh here the following speech:

> Where is mine host of the gartyr?
> Now my Host I would desire you looke you now,
> To have a care of your entertainments,
> For there is three sorts of garmombles,
> Is cosen all the Host of Maidenhead & Readings,
> Now you are an honest man and a scuruy beggerly lowsie knave beside:
> And can point wrong places,
> I tell you for good will, grate why my Host.

Ever since the suggestion was first made by Charles Knight in his Pictorial Edition of Shakespeare's Works, 1838–43, the majority of scholars have accepted the view that the passage about the stolen horses with its allusions to the 'cozen-germans' and 'garmombles' (Quarto, 1602) was a reminiscence of the visit of the Count of Mümpelgart (Mompelgard)—afterwards Duke of Würtemberg and Teck—to England in 1592. He was allowed by official order to take up post-horses and pay nothing for the same, which, no doubt, caused much dissatisfaction among the inn-keepers.

Leaving aside the question of the authenticity of the Quarto text, let us consider the singular word 'garmombles' which it offers. Dr Greg says (p. 86):

'If "garmombles" is anything but a wild blunder of the compositor, it must be not a fragment of the original text but a sly allusion to the censored episode introduced by the actor (an Elizabethan Pelissier) for the benefit of an audience familiar with current dramatic scandal.'

Again, in his *England as seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First* (London, 1865), which contains a translation of the journal of the Count's travels in England, W. B. Rye says (Introduction, p. xcviii):

'We would ask now whether this term *garmombles* used by Shakespeare can by any possibility be intended for anything else but a playful joke upon the Duke's title of Mompelgard—a joke which would have had a peculiar relish for the members of a court to whom the German had recently paid a visit; but if the word be archaic, and a meaning can be found for it, we are willing to yield the point.'

That 'garmombles,' however, is not a compositor's blunder but a genuine archaic or dialectic word whose meaning suits well with the context of the passage in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is evident, I believe, from the following lines of the early Elizabethan play, *Misogonus*, II, iii, 78 f., where Liturgus says:

> I warrent you I heis nether wounded nor slayne,
> had a litle girmumble I thinke & no more.

The passage may be most conveniently consulted in R. Warwick Bond's *Early Italian Plays* (Oxford, 1911), p. 202. Mr Bond has the following note (p. 310) to 'girmumble':

'"*Jurmungle* obs. sb. Yks. A mess, confusion." *D.D.*: also as obs. Scotch verb and sb. *Jurmummle*, crushing, disfiguring.'

But Wright's *Dialect Dictionary* also gives as a meaning of *jurmummle* 'to bamboozle,' which fits better with the context of the passage in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. There is accordingly a play on words in the 'garmombles' of the Quarto, just as there is in the 'cozen-Iermans' of the Folio. That 'garmombles' is a genuine word does not conflict, however, in any way, as Rye seemed to think, with the idea that it was also intended as a hit at the German prince through a metathesis of the syllables that make up his name. Quite the contrary.

J. Douglas Bruce.

Knoxville, Tennessee, U.S.A.

Drummond and Browne.

In the *Modern Language Review* for July, 1911, Professor Kastner printed a number of unpublished poems from the Hawthornden MSS. for which we owe him many thanks. But despite the precautions 'taken to preclude any such contingency' he included the well-known colloquy of Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*. The error has recently been corrected (January, 1911), and the matter might have been passed over apart from the interesting fact that there are some differences between the two texts.

For purposes of comparison with Professor Kastner's text I append the version given in the pirated edition of the *Religio Medici* (1642):

> The night is come like to the day,
> Depart not thou great God away.
> Let not my sinnes, blacke as the night,
> Eclipse the lustre of thy light.
> Keepe still in my Horizon, for to me,
> The Sun makes not the day, but thee.
> Thou whose nature cannot sleepe,
> On my temples centry keepe;

Guard me 'gainst those watchfull foes,
Whose eyes are open, while mine close.
Let not dreames my head infest,
But such as Jacobs temples blest.
While I doe rest, my soule advance,
Make me sleepe a holy trance:
That I may take my rest being wrought,
Awake into some holy thought.
And with as active vigor run
My course, as doth the nimble Sun.
Sleepe is a death, O make me try,
By sleeping what it is to dye.
And downe as gently lay my head
On my Grave, as now my Bed.
Howere refresh'd, great God let me
Awake againe at last with thee.
And thus assur'd, behold I lie
Securely, or to wake or die.
These are my drowsie dayes, in vaine
I doe now wake to sleepe againe.
O come that houre, when I shall never
Sleepe thus againe but wake for ever.

In 1643 Browne issued 'a full and intended copy of that peece which was most imperfectly and surreptitiously published before.' The version of the 'night piece' differs slightly from that given above. Apart from unimportant differences of spelling the following changes occur: l. 11 'no dreames,' l. 14 'my sleepe,' l. 15 'That I may, my rest being wroght,' l. 21 'And as gently lay my head,' l. 23 'Howere I rest, great God let me,' l. 30 'sleepe againe.' It is obvious that the change in l. 15 is an improvement from the point of view of sense, and the same is perhaps true of l. 23.

Drummond's version seems, on the whole, to follow that of the 1642 edition, cf. ll. 15 and 23, but he is rightly offended by the ungrammatical 'thee,' found in both the 1642 and 1643 texts of the *Religio Medici*, and changes to 'thou' (l. 6).

Professor Kastner points out that Drummond was 'so accustomed to transcribe passages or entire poems from all kinds of authors, that of the unpublished pieces here selected one or two may be found to which the Scottish poet has no better claim than that of being an amanuensis.' In the present instance, the amanuensis has managed to introduce one improvement. We may note, as a piece of contemporary criticism, that Sir Kenelm Digby in his 'Observations upon Religio Medici' (1643) alludes to the poem in the following lukewarm terms: 'In his concluding prayer, wherein he summeth up all he wisheth; me thinketh his arrow is not winged with that fire which I should have expected from him upon this occasion.'

P. G. Thomas.

London.

Dante and the 'Mahabharata.'

The first recorded reference to the *Mahabharata*—that great collection of Indian epic poetry described as 'a heterogeneous mass of legendary and didactic matter, worked into and around a central heroic narrative'—is met with in the fifth century B.C., but, as Professor Macdonell remarks in his *History of Sanscrit Literature*, it may, owing to the immemorial practice of recitation, have been in use long before it began to be recorded. In the form in which we know it, it has not changed since about 500 A.D. To give some idea of its length, it may be recalled that it is nearly eightfold that of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* combined.

It has been noted by M. Vitti in *L' Alghieri* (1889), and M. de Gubernatis in the *Giornale Dantesco*, vol. III, and by other scholars, that there may be links connecting the *Mahabharata* with the *Divina Commedia*. The suggestions of MM. Vitti and de Gubernatis have, however, been wholly denied by M. Blochet in his scholarly work, *Les sources orientales de la Divina Commedia*. He says: 'Le Mahabharata n'a certainement rien à voir avec l'œuvre de Dante.' It is therefore with some diffidence that I venture to draw attention to one point which I think has not hitherto been noticed, but which seems to suggest an opposite conclusion. Judging from medieval literature generally, with its apparent delight in the gruesome and horrible, its supreme interest in the future, and its teaching that, for the vast majority of mankind, death is but the beginning of endless tortures, such descriptions as the *Mahabharata* gives of the nether world are such as could not have failed to make a deep impression, and although Sanscrit scholars are agreed that not even so much as an abstract of the *Mahabharata* could have been known in Europe in the Middle Ages, it seems not only possible, but also probable, that writers may have acquired some hearsay knowledge of its plot through the Arabs, those great disseminators of Oriental thought.

With the complicated series of histories of which the *Mahabharata* is composed, largely the result of accretions due to constant recitation, we are not here concerned, but only with certain episodes towards the end of it. The last two books, or 'parvas,' of the *Mahabharata*, called respectively 'The Great Journey,' and 'The Entry into Heaven[1],' tell how the king Yudhisthura, sovereign of all the known earth, lays aside

[1] Mahāprasthānika Parva, Sect. 1, and Swargarohanika Parva, Sect. 2. The quotations are taken from the translation by Pratapa Chandra Ray.

his sceptre ere death comes to him, and, accompanied by his wife, his brethren, and a dog, sets out for Mount Meru, the Heavenly Mountain, where dwell the Gods. On the way, his human companions sink down and die, and the King and the dog alone arrive at the foot of the mountain. Upon his refusal, even at the risk of thereby losing Heaven, to comply with the request of the Gods—who desire to test his loyalty—that he should abandon the faithful dog that has followed him throughout his journey, the dog is transformed into the God of Justice, and now nothing seems left to prevent his attainment of the Celestial goal. But on the threshold he hesitates, for he cannot see those whom on Earth he has held most dear. 'This is not Heaven,' he exclaims, 'I wish not to stay here. That is Heaven where those brethren of mine are.' The Gods, unable to dissuade him, and 'ready to do what is agreeable' to him, command a celestial messenger to show him his friends and kinsmen. He now enters on 'a path difficult and inauspicious, and enveloped in thick darkness.' It is called 'the Sinners' Way,' and led to the lower sphere, and, as described in the *Mahabharata*, 'it abounded with gadflys and stinging bees and gnats...it was noisome with worms and insects.'

In passing, but without specially emphasizing the point, we may recall Dante's vision of the cowardly neutrals (*Inf.*, iii, 65) 'in the starless air,' just within Hell's gate, 'these unfortunates were sorely goaded by hornets and wasps that were there. These made their faces stream with blood, which, mixed with tears, was gathered at their feet by loathsome worms' (Carlyle's trans.). Here Dante gives the same idea, but raised by his dramatic imagination to the acme of horror.

Returning to the *Mahabharata*[1], we read that, proceeding through a region abounding in every sort of foulness, Yudhisthura 'beheld a river full of boiling water, and therefore difficult to cross, as also a forest of trees whose leaves were sharp swords and razors. There were plains full of fine white sand, exceedingly heated.' It is to these last three incidents, the boiling river, the forest of sword-leaved trees, and the desert of fiery sand, and to their sequence, that I wish specially to draw attention, for when we turn to the *Inferno*, Cantos xii, xiii, and xiv, we find not only that the three incidents there set out bear a striking resemblance to those quoted from the *Mahabharata*, but that they are recorded in the same sequence, although it is true that in the *Mahabharata* the direful situations are given without details, whereas, with Dante, the development of horrors seems almost to run riot. To

[1] Swargarohanika Parva, Sect. 2, ver. 23 and 24.

the river of boiling water, difficult to cross, of the *Mahabharata*, there corresponds the river of boiling blood which Dante could only cross with miraculous assistance. To the forest of trees whose leaves were sharp swords and razors, there corresponds the Forest of Suicides, whose trees were pronged with poisoned, withered sticks. To the plains of sand, exceedingly heated, there corresponds the Desert of Fiery Sand (*Inf.*, xiv, 28 and 37), 'Over all the great sand, falling slowly, rained dilated flakes of fire,' and 'So fell the eternal heat, by which the sand was kindled.'

Each situation may, indeed, be to some extent paralleled in medieval literature, whilst the Forest of Suicides finds a possible prototype in the *Aeneid*, though it is worthy of note that the tree-imprisoned soul of Polydorus cries out 'Harvests of iron have sprouted and grown with spears from my heart,' which comes closer to the sharp swords and razors of the *Mahabharata* than to the withered sticks of Dante.

In an age overwhelmed with a tremendous sense of sin, death, and judgment, to dwell in thought on prospective suffering seemed a wholesome discipline, and therefore if Dante, by his rendering, raises the sense of the awful to white heat, he is only expressing the feeling of the time, intensified by a poet's inspiration.

The incidents above quoted from the *Mahabharata* and Dante respectively correspond so closely as regards matter, and so absolutely as regards sequence, that it is very difficult to believe that even if Dante elaborated his ideas from other more accessible sources, as, for instance, the Vision of Alberico, monk of Cassino, which tells, though not in sequence, of a river of blood, and a forest of sharp and thorny trees, his arrangement of the three consecutive incidents referred to, in three consecutive cantos, was not suggested by some knowledge, however indirect, of the *Mahabharata*.

ALICE KEMP-WELCH.

LONDON.

REVIEWS.

The Tragedies of Seneca translated into English Verse. By FRANK JUSTUS MILLER. Introduced by an essay on the influence of the tragedies of Seneca upon early English drama, by John Matthews Manly. Chicago: University Press. 1907. 8vo. ix + 534 pp.

So much attention has been directed in recent years to the influence of Seneca's tragedies on the Elizabethan drama by such works as Fischer's *Kunstentwicklung der englischen Tragödie* and Cunliffe's *Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy,* that any attempt to make the tragedies themselves familiar to the student of English literature is to be heartily welcomed. English translations of Seneca's plays are not numerous. The *Tenne Tragedies of Seneca* (1581) by Heywood, Neville, Newton, Nuce, and Studley; W. Bradshaw's prose rendering of the collected plays (1902); and Dr Ella Harris's verse translation (1904) exhaust the list, I believe[1]. Of these the last-mentioned is the only one which gives any real help to the student of English literature whose Latin has grown rusty, and this translation by Mr Miller possesses certain valuable features, viz. the introductory essay by Prof. Manly, comparative analyses of plays and a mythological index, which are lacking to Dr Harris's excellent version.

Mr Miller has used blank verse for the dramatic portions of all the plays except the *Medea,* and on the whole he has handled it with skill, though there are some heavy and prosaic passages. The rendering of the speech of Hippolytus in praise of the simple life (*Hipp.* 484—564) may be taken as a favourable specimen of his powers. The experiment made in *Medea* of reproducing the iambic trimeter of the original is not attended with much success, as the translator himself admits in his preface. The lyric portions of the ten plays have been rendered in a variety of metres, and in these Mr Miller's touch is very uncertain. What is to be said of this chorus from *Medea*:

> The fairest of girls is she,
> The Athenian maids outshining,
> Or the Spartan maiden with armor laden,
> No burden of war declining.
>
> Not by Alpheus' sacred stream,
> Nor Bœotia's musical water,
> Is there any fair who can compare
> With our lovely Corinthian daughter.
>
> (*Medea*, 75—82.)

[1] This list does not include versions of separate plays, of which several examples may be found in the seventeenth and succeeding centuries.

The famous prophecy in the same play:

> Venient annis saecula seris,
> quibus Oceanus vincula rerum
> laxet et ingens pateat tellus.
> Tethysque novos detegat orbes
> nec sit terris ultima Thule

which ought to have peculiar interest for one of Mr Miller's nationality, is very tamely and ineffectively rendered. At times the translator's use of colloquialisms in the midst of speeches written otherwise in dignified English, jars somewhat on the ear; and there are a few annoying misprints, e.g. 'acocunt' for 'account' (*Œd.* 709), 'be' for 'he' (*Medea*, 652).

The translation is fairly accurate, though one or two blunders may be noted.

> No sinner seeks to shirk his punishment
> (*Herc. Œt.* 899.)

is a strange version of

> Nemo nocens sibi ipse poenas abrogat,

which Dr Harris renders correctly as

> He who sins
> May not himself annul the punishment.

(The Elizabethan translation, following the reading 'inrogat' for 'abrogat,' renders the passage 'No gylty one doth use To take reuengemente of themselues.')

The whole of the dialogue between Hyllus and Deianira is poorly translated by Mr Miller.

> Whoe'er ignores his fate and spares himself,
> Deservedly has erred, deserves to die
> (*Herc. Œt.* 887—8.)

is not an adequate rendering of

> Quicumque fato ignoscit et parcit sibi
> errare meruit: morte damnari placet.

Sometimes Seneca's dialogue loses its point through the translator's failure to keep the Latin play upon words. Thus Mr Miller renders

> *Thes.* Lacrimae nonne te nostrae movent?
> *Ph.* Mors optima est perire lacrimandum suis
> (*Hipp.* 880—1.)

by

> *Th.* Will not my tears avail with thee?
> *Ph.* That death is best which one's own friends lament.

Prof. Manly contributes an excellent introductory essay on the influence of Seneca's tragedies on early English drama, and at the end of the book there is a helpful table of comparison between Seneca's plays and their Greek originals.

Perhaps one suggestion for future editions may be added. Since the intrinsic literary value of Seneca's tragedies is so small, and it is certain that henceforth their importance will lie chiefly in their relation to the Elizabethan drama, would it not be useful to add foot-notes giving alternative renderings in those places where the Elizabethan editions of the text differ from Leo's, which Mr Miller has followed? It is true that the Elizabethan translators of Seneca made use of two or three Latin editions, as has been pointed out by E. Jockers in his dissertation *Die englischen Seneca-Übersetzer*, but the variations of text in these are generally unimportant, and Cunliffe's example might well be followed in taking the Aldine of Avantius (1517) as representing fairly the text of Seneca as known to the Elizabethans.

EVELYN M. SPEARING.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Hexaplar Psalter, being the Book of Psalms in Six English Versions. Edited by WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT. Cambridge: University Press. 1911. 4to. vi + 390 pp.

The history of the English versions of the Psalms is particularly interesting, and the Cambridge University Press has conferred a benefit on the public by issuing this Hexapla as part of the commemoration of the Bible tercentenary. It is edited by Mr Aldis Wright, whose knowledge of the subject and scholarly accuracy are unsurpassed, and it contains in parallel columns the six principal translations of the Psalms which belong to the period of printing, viz. those of Coverdale's Bible, 1535, of the Great Bible, 1539, of Geneva, 1560, of the Bishops' Bible, 1568, of the Authorised Version, 1611, and of the Revised Version, 1885. Coverdale's original version, on which he evidently bestowed exceptional pains, was founded upon a combination of the two principal German translations with that of the Vulgate. Mr Aldis Wright refers briefly in his Preface to the question of the 'five sundry interpreters' whose authority Coverdale alleges in the Dedication of his Bible, and apparently thinks it necessary to suppose that five were actually used in the Psalms. But when Coverdale mentions his five interpreters, it is in reference to the Bible generally, and Tindale may well have been one of them, though the translator could get no assistance from him in the Psalter. Pagninus may also have been one; but of him Coverdale actually made little use. It would be interesting to know on what grounds Mr Wright suggests Jerome's so-called 'Versio Hebraica' as one of the authorities used here by Coverdale. In his translation of the Psalms Coverdale evidently aimed from the first at such rhythmical smoothness as would render them suitable for singing, and this aim was pursued still further in the Great Bible, where we have Coverdale's own revision of his earlier work, with the help of Münster's Latin version. He does not scruple to make additions purely with this object, as where he writes, 'God is a ryghteous iudge *strong and pacient*,' for 'God is a

rightuous iudge,' or 'there is not one that doth good, *no not one*,' for 'there is not one that doth good.' Admirable as his final version is, there were many who thought that he had gone much too far in the sacrifice of sense to sound, and the reviser of the Psalms for the Bishops' Bible, after protesting against this in a special preface, set to work with a very different method from that which was pursued in most of the other books of the Bible, altering almost every verse, and evidently preferring to destroy the established rhythm, even when no difference was made in the meaning. Where Coverdale had written, 'O ye sonnes of men, how longe wyll ye blaspheme myne honour? and haue soch pleasure in vanyte, and seke after lesyng?' he has 'O ye sonnes of men, how long [wyll ye go about to bryng] my glory to confusion? ye loue vanitie, ye seeke after lyes': where Coverdale says 'consydre my meditacion' (with which the Authorised and Revised Versions agree), he has, 'vnderstande thou my pensifnesse': where Coverdale has 'longe sufferynge, and of great goodnesse,' he prefers 'loth to be angry, and exceedyng great in mercie.' No doubt his version is more correct, but it is full of gratuitous awkwardness, and in the later editions of the Bishops' Bible it was thought advisable to print the singing version with it in parallel columns. The Authorised Version returns in a very large number of instances to the abandoned phraseology of the Great Bible in the Psalter, a circumstance which is hardly found in the translation of any other book of the Bible; but of course the Geneva Bible had its influence also, and it was probably understood by that time that in the services of the Church the Great Bible Psalms would continue to be used, and therefore the requirements of singing need no longer be specially kept in view.

In his Appendix Mr Aldis Wright, besides collecting the marginal readings of the six texts, gives all the variations of the two later editions of Coverdale's Bible, as compared with that of 1535, of the six editions of the Great Bible, from April 1540 to Dec. 1541, as compared with that of 1539, and of the two first editions (1568 and 1569) of the Bishops' Bible. Unsparing labour such as this, demanding the greatest care and accuracy, and asking for no reward except the pleasure of doing sound work, deserves the special acknowledgement of scholars.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Life in Shakespeare's England. A Book of Elizabethan Prose. Compiled by John Dover Wilson. Cambridge: University Press. 1911. 8vo. xvi + 292 pp.

Mr Wilson's aim is to set before us the England that Shakespeare knew in a series of descriptive extracts drawn from contemporary writers. His book is admirably planned and admirably executed. His wide knowledge of Elizabethan literature and his appreciation of its human side are put to good use in his selection of illustrative passages

and it was a particularly happy thought to group these passages in relation to Shakespeare. No student of Elizabethan history or literature but will be the better for having seen Elizabethan life under Mr Wilson's guidance.

The main sections of the book are entitled respectively 'England and the English,' 'The Country-side,' 'Superstition,' 'Education,' 'London,' 'Books and Authors,' 'The Theatre,' 'The Court,' 'House and Home,' 'Rogues and Vagabonds,' 'The Sea,' while a happy conclusion is found in Nicholas Breton's account of 'An Elizabethan Day.' We need not mention all the authors whom Mr Wilson calls in to fill up his pictures: when however we say that they include Ascham, Lyly, Sidney, Lodge, Nashe, Dekker, Raleigh, Hakluyt, Overbury, Earle, Joseph Hall, Fynes Morison, Coryat, W. Harrison, G. Markham, P. Stubbes, R. Scot, W. Bullein, Stow, J. Howell and Fuller, it will be seen at once that the book apart from its particular theme, forms an admirable introduction to the prose-writers of the Elizabethan age. We cannot think that a schoolboy will find any page of the book dull, though he will perhaps be most pleased with the racy extract from Harman's *Caveat for Common Cursetors*. And everywhere he will catch from the vigorous and imaginative English of these selected passages something of the warmth and glow and energy of the greatest age that England has known.

What faults we find are of a very minor kind. Mr Wilson has added to his selection eight pages of 'Glossary and Notes.' It seems to us that it would have been better if these notes had been rather more numerous, even if one or two passages in the book had been sacrificed to make the required space, for example that on page 105 which relates to Germany rather than England and part of that on p. 164 which describes the dress of Venetian courtezans. The passages abound in obsolete expressions, which will not be intelligible to the ordinary reader, and if there is to be a Glossary to the book at all, it should include more of these than it does. I need only mention 'manured' (p. 7) (= handled), 'merchants by the great' (p. 8), 'harlots' (p. 96) (used of men), 'carted' (p. 102), 'an embossment in terrace work' (p. 119), 'sirreverence' (p. 127), 'by slot' (p. 166), 'in print' (p. 174). The expression 'to cry creak' (p. 20) is not adequately explained by the note in the Glossary, 'Creak. The cry of a cock.' The allusion to woolpacks as the foundation of a bridge (p. 20) needed a note.

The text of certain passages presents difficulty. Occasionally Mr Wilson has suggested an emendation in brackets, occasionally he has left the difficulty unsolved. One or two of his emendations are doubtful: thus (p. 14) it is not necessary to alter 'being' to 'seeing' in the sentence 'ignorance will not suffer her to do ill, being her mind is to do well,' nor (p. 219) to alter 'associate' to 'associate with' in the phrase 'to associate the nobleman.' (Cp. p. 248, 'I would have him to associate me thither.')

Among passages which seem to need emendation is one on p. 101.

'When the bell-man for anger to spite (such a purloiner of citizens' goods) so many, hath bounced at the door like a madman.' Mr Wilson suggests 'spy' for 'spite,' but even so the sentence seems to be faulty. Should it stand 'such a purloiner of so many citizens' goods'?

On p. 137 the word 'wrote' seems required before 'to one Pison.' On p. 111, l. 8 from bottom, 'raking' should perhaps be 'taking,' and on p. 112, l. 11, 'trumpets' should be 'strumpets.'

Mr Wilson appends to his extracts the date of the edition of the book used, and generally that of the first edition as well, if he used a later one. One might wish that in some cases he had also given the approximate date of composition—as that is the material thing in connexion with an account of English life. From this point of view it is misleading to have Sir Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum* dated 1583 instead of c. 1551 and King James' *Counterblast* 1672 instead of 1604.

These small points would not be worth mentioning but for the fact that Mr Wilson has produced a charming and scholarly work, which deserves to be read by all who are interested in Shakespeare and his age, and which should hold its ground for many years to come.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Literary Criticism from the Elizabethan Dramatists. By David Klein. New York: Sturgis & Walton. 1910. 8vo. xviii + 257 pp.

Whatever else Dr Klein has done in this work he has collected a number of passages from the Elizabethan dramatists which go to illustrate their dramatic theory and practice; and in view of the failure on the part of the contemporary critics to pronounce at all adequately upon the popular drama of the day, these passages are of considerable interest as supplementing in some measure what these critics had to say. Critical utterances of this casual kind were perhaps the natural outcome of the literary conditions which then prevailed, for the rise of the new drama implied a continuous exercise of the critical faculty. Each new and experimental form argued a more or less reasoned departure from earlier method and consequently the dramatist often permitted himself the liberty of putting into the mouths of his characters certain views which he, the dramatist, held concerning his craft. In any case the practice seems to have been common and Dr Klein has cast his net fairly wide, paying, as was natural, chief attention to Shakespeare and Jonson, but taking care as well to look both before and after.

It may however be doubted whether the somewhat formal classification he adopts and to which he rigidly adheres was best calculated to serve the purpose he had in view. It has its advantages in introducing a certain amount of method into the inquiry: but, on the other hand, ideas on literature can scarcely be pigeon-holed in this rigorous fashion. At any rate, something is undoubtedly lost in a process which could

not help passing over much of that implicit criticism which is everywhere present in the Elizabethan drama and of which Chaucer, in his *Sir Thopas* has given an earlier example; for instance Shakespeare's disguised pronouncements in *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale* on pastoralism in literature, the burlesque of romance in a play like *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, or the demand made by the domestic plays for familiar events and for language plain and unadorned.

Then again Dr Klein is not always happy in interpreting a critical statement. He sees in Polonius' 'humorous enumeration of mongrels' merely an expression of disapproval with regard to 'the incongruous mingling practised by the earlier dramatists.' But more than this is surely involved in the passage. Shakespeare's list of 'pastoral-comical, historical-comical' and the rest is not pure fooling, it embodies a positive truth, stating in effect that the new drama could not be partitioned out into the ancient kinds but that its elements were to be as mixed as life itself. In dealing with another of Shakespeare's enigmatic utterances—those words of Theseus relating to poetry and the imagination—a passage so often misquoted and misunderstood, Dr Klein is rather more successful. He allows for the dramatic quality of the speech but rashly concludes that it is 'the essential emptiness of poetry [that] is here insisted on.' The passage is, in truth, a thorny one: it required a more than careful handling, and Professor Mackail's elucidation of the speech in his recent volume *Lectures on Poetry* will be welcomed by all students of literature.

But while this work of Dr Klein's bears the marks of considerable industry and contains the fruit of careful search and thought, it must be added that it suffers badly in the matter of presentment, more particularly in the style and tone which the writer, in his occasional comment, has chosen to adopt. Coleridge is stated to have thought a certain speech 'just great.' Scaliger is said 'to have gone back of Aristotle to the practice of Aischylos.' Speaking of the fate which overtook Jonson's commentary on Horace, the writer expresses a wish that 'it had not been destroyed in that confounded conflagration.' These things are perhaps a matter of taste, but they appear to be out of place in what professes to be a work of scholarship; they suggest a levity of treatment that is not in accordance with the rest of the work. In Dr Klein's repertory of critical utterances there is much that will prove useful to later workers in the same field; and it is upon the merits of this collection that Dr Klein would have judgment passed. All the same, one could have wished this phraseology away, while equally desirable would have been the addition of an index at the end of the work for purposes of reference. The absence of this index is a grave defect. The bibliography which takes up the last few pages will doubtless prove useful, but then it is not an index.

J. W. H. Atkins.

Aberystwyth.

The Serpent of Division, by John Lydgate. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and a Glossary by H. N. MacCracken. Oxford: University Press. 1911. 4to. 75 pp.

Dr MacCracken's edition of Lydgate's *Serpent of Division* is a careful and scholarly piece of work which has the merit of having rendered accessible to students of English an interesting prose work of the early fifteenth century, 'the only well-authenticated prose work,' in fact, which came from the pen of Lydgate. The text has a further interest in that it contains the most extensive treatment of Julius Caesar in the whole range of Middle English literature; and while its popularity as a political tract seems to have lasted well on into the sixteenth century, if we are to judge from the printed fragments still extant, its theme, the dangers of national division, was frequently repeated at a later date and appears for instance in the early play of *Gorboduc*. No great artistic merits can perhaps be claimed for the tract; its prose style is no better and no worse than that of the average fifteenth century production. On the other hand Lydgate's material is of considerable interest. It is drawn from various sources with judgment and care, and the editor in tracking his author through the ample medieval chronicles has supplied an interesting as well as a useful commentary upon medieval methods of work. In short the editorial labours leave little to be desired. The best work is perhaps done in the careful elucidation of these sources: but the text, notes and glossary are all good, clear and concise (there is apparently a misprint of *wrowt* for *wrowȝt* on p. 53, l. 1); and the edition is made attractive in another sense, by the inclusion of three very choice full-page reproductions of contemporary MS. pictures taken from the Yates Thomson MS. of *Li Fait des Romains*.

There is one matter however, and that a rather important one, where the editor appears to be at fault, namely, in the date which he assigns to the composition of the work. All four MSS. belong to the second half of the fifteenth century but at the end of the text in the Calthorpe MS. there is the following significant statement: 'The forseide division so to schewe I have remembred this forseid littil translacion. The moneth of Decembre, the ffirste yere of oure sovereigne lord that now ys king henry the vj^{te}.' And, then again, in the colophon of the same MS. (Calthorpe) the date 1400 is found. So that there seem to be two possible dates: the year 1422 (i.e. the first year of the reign of Henry VI) and secondly, the date 1400; and it is the later of these dates upon which Dr MacCracken has fixed, in spite of the awkward evidence of the colophon.

In the first place he rightly rejects the idea of reading Henry IV instead of Henry VI in the passage already quoted. This change would not clear the matter up, while it would imply not only a conceivable scribal slip (the numeral IV having been read as VI), but also a substitution of the abbreviation *-te* for the *-þe* which would have appeared with IV^{þe}. But when he proceeds to dismiss the possibility

of the date 1400 on the ground that Chaucer is referred to as 'some one long dead' his argument is scarcely in keeping with the facts. Chaucer is mentioned (p. 65) as one 'þat was flowre of poetis...þe firste þat euer enluminede owre langage,...my maistere Chaucere which compendiously wrote þe deþe of þis miȝte Emperour.' This description does not necessarily refer to one 'long dead.' It is quite conceivable that Lydgate writing in 1400 would speak in similar terms of his master who had died in the December of the preceding year (1399).

Nor is the evidence of the colophon contradicted by the interesting fact which Dr MacCracken brings forward for that purpose, namely, that at the end of the *Story of Thebes* we find Lydgate developing a train of thought similar to that of the *Serpent of Division* and developing it moreover in language closely parallel. The *Story* was completed somewhere between the years 1421 and 1425, and it certainly seems possible that in this passage Lydgate may have been making use of an earlier work of his, the *Serpent of Division* for instance, supposing it to have been written in 1400. And even supposing its date of composition to have been 1422, the *Story* may, notwithstanding, have been the work indebted, for, as has already been stated, the *Story* was not certainly completed until 1425.

On the other hand things become rather more plain if we accept the date (1400) given by the colophon as the year of composition. Then in the year 1422, a year of political unrest owing to the death of Henry V, it may well have been that the time seemed to Lydgate to call for the reappearance of a political tract which contained such seasonable counsel as the *Serpent of Division*, and that he was therefore induced to reproduce that earlier work of his. Supposing that revision to have been made in 1422, it would account for the interesting parallel already mentioned in the *Story of Thebes*; the thought and the diction of the prose pamphlet would be fresh in Lydgate's memory when he proceeded with the completion of that poem. But some such revision seems to have been actually made. As Dr MacCracken himself states, one particular MS. (the Calthorpe) shows modernising tendencies, a statement that is readily corroborated by a reference to the variant readings contained in the footnotes of his edition. The text of that particular MS., moreover, ends with the quotation 'I have remembred this forseid littil translacion'; a statement which in its very wording seems to imply some such process of revision. And lastly it is at the end of this passage, which is peculiar to the Calthorpe MS., that the year 1422 is substantially quoted; a date which must therefore be regarded as the date of a reproduction, while to the year 1400 must be assigned the original composition of the work.

J. W. H. Atkins.

Aberystwyth.

Selected Dramas of John Dryden with the Rehearsal by George Villiers Duke of Buckingham. Edited with Introduction and Notes by GEORGE R. NOYES. Chicago and New York: Scott, Foresman & Co. 1910. 8vo. lvi + 504 pp.

This volume, the product of much labour, will be most acceptable to the student and is not to be repelled even by the general reader who has any curiosity in the history of literature. The four plays which Professor Noyes selects to represent Dryden's dramatic work are the *Conquest of Granada* (both parts), *Marriage à la Mode*, *All for Love*, and the *Spanish Friar*. It does not appear that the selection could be better. Besides a carefully formed text of the four plays and of the *Rehearsal*, the inclusion of which is of considerable additional interest to the book, the volume contains notes, printed separately at the end, on all five plays, and also, by way of introduction to the whole, an elaborate essay of near fifty pages on Dryden as dramatist, followed by a careful chronological list of the dramatic works.

Professor Noyes cannot be accused of exaggerating the attractions of his subject. He appraises most modestly the general interest for modern readers of the Restoration Literature and states temperately and frankly the solid objections to which Dryden as a dramatic artist is open. On the former point indeed, the interest of Dryden at large and of the period which he ruled, we would fain hope that the editor goes beyond the necessary limit of depression. With the rarest exceptions no past age, if we may speak candidly, commands or will command for such poetry either a numerous or a very studious public. But the little labour and the little use of a slight exercise of imagination necessary to the full enjoyment and comprehension of *Absalom and Achitophel* will surely not be grudged in this country, though in America competing interests, if we do not misunderstand the editor, threaten to stifle even this.

Of Professor Noyes' present volume the notes perhaps are the most valuable part; but they do not afford material for such discussion as is possible here. In all that concerns the formation of the text the work seems to be admirably thorough. The notes on language are interesting and useful, so far as they go; of explanation most readers, I think, will want rather more than they will find.

The introductory essay with its footnotes offers a full account of the subject and a valuable collection of references. It abounds of course in points open to discussion. For the most part I find no ground of objection. One may perhaps be surprised, considering the proportions of the whole work, by the space allotted (pp. xxxv ff.) to the unfortunate controversy with Settle about *The Empress of Morocco* and Dryden's part in the miserable railing of the anonymous *Notes and Observations* of 1674. Professor Noyes warns us indeed himself that 'as this work was a joint production, we cannot be sure that Dryden wrote any particular part of it' but he adds that 'as he undoubtedly read and

approved the whole, the question is of little moment; we may regard the opinions in general of the pamphlet as Dryden's own,' and he immediately proceeds to quote some scurrilous and clumsy passages with confident attribution to our poet. Unless the editor relies upon some evidence which I do not apprehend, this seems to go rather far, especially as the tone and style of the citations offer, as Professor Noyes points out, most striking contrast to Dryden's treatment of similar topics in his acknowledged work.

The specimen of Dryden's verbal criticism, cited for the purpose of this comparison, is from the preface of *The State of Innocence*—the defence of the metaphor in

> Seraph and Cherub careless of their charge...
> Unguarded leave the passes of the sky
> And all dissolv'd in Hallelujahs lie.

Dryden's critic is crude enough and Dryden's rebuke very dignified, but if Professor Noyes means to imply that it is adequate, we may hesitate to follow him. Certainly Dryden's quotation from Virgil 'Invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam' is no justification, nor do I for a moment believe that Dryden, as he says, took from it his own expression. It is one of the off-hand metaphors with which his critical works abound. In style and suggestiveness these cannot be over-praised, but in regard to their substance and principles the late flow of opinion in their favour seems to have gone quite far enough. The opinions which Dryden expresses are as often as not taken up for the convenience of the moment, but doubtless he shows through all his wanderings a saving common-sense and an instinctive appreciation of various merit.

Upon the very interesting topic of Dryden's habit in matters of controversy Professor Noyes makes a new suggestion (p. xxxiii). Speaking of Dryden's patient treatment of *The Rehearsal* he says:

> In the critical essays published with *The Conquest of Granada* in 1672 Dryden certainly makes no allusion to the attack on him. He even seems determined...to show generosity by returning good for evil. 'Fletcher's Don John is our [modern dramatists'] only bugbear; and yet I may affirm...that he now speaks better, and that his character is maintained with much more vigour in the fourth and fifth acts than it was by Fletcher in the three former.' This is a direct compliment to Buckingham's alteration of Fletcher's *The Chances*.

The editor's criticism of the selected plays is candid and reasonable; he points out clearly the crude opposition of sentiment and tone which separates the serious and the comic parts even of such heroic plays as *Marriage à la Mode* and *The Spanish Friar* which in the mere mechanical adjustment of the two plots show some ingenuity. And indeed it would be difficult to surpass the disconcerting candour with which Dryden himself speaks on the subject when he chooses to exert himself in the defence of his theatrical practice. His various remarks set side by side offer a fine specimen of his scruples as a critic.

This is no place for airing a private opinion, not to say a private heresy; otherwise I would say a word about the interest both intrinsic

and biographical of two pieces which on grounds very just, so far as they go, are neglected—the so-called 'heroic' play *Tyrannic Love*, upon the martyrdom of St Catharine of Alexandria, and *The State of Innocence*, Dryden's adaptation of *Paradise Lost* to the stage. *Tyrannic Love*, notwithstanding its gross offences, is not altogether such wild phantasy—I cannot consent to a milder term—as *The Conquest of Granada*. To class Maximin as a character with Almansor, though Dryden does it when it suits him, is not quite fair. But this must be for another time. It would be absurd to suggest that the present editor should or could include either piece in his selection.

Nor will proportion let me say here all that is suggested by Professor Noyes' remarks upon Dryden and the unities. They are true and clear, but in my opinion they do not lay stress enough—nor does any account of the matter that I know—upon the root of the amazing absurdities and falsehoods with which in the end the Renaissance critics try to harmonize their theories on the subject. Dryden is no better than another and forces a candid reader to ask in many places how a reasonable man came by such monstrosities. In one word it was mainly I think because they took 'imitation,' as used by Aristotle, to signify the production of an *illusory* resemblance between the scene and the supposed reality, and then struggled vainly to find a reconciliation between the practical deductions which would have followed from such a theory and those that might be drawn more or less justly from the real position of the Greek critic.

However, this and many another topic of interest, which the editor of this book suggests, we must let pass. It remains only once more to commend it for what it contains and achieves to the student and the reader.

A. W. Verrall.

Cambridge.

Homer's Odyssey: a Line-for-line Translation in the Metre of the Original. By H. B. Cotterill. With twenty-four Illustrations by Patten Wilson. London: Harrap & Co. 1911. 4to. xxiii + 335 pp.

This new translation of the *Odyssey* comes out with every advantage of stately form and artistic dress. Other translators have been content to give us their versions piecemeal; Mr Cotterill has preferred to wait till he could issue his complete. It has been a labour of love, and of years. The idea came to him long ago during explorations in Central Africa, making him wish to reproduce in English verse the 'simplicity, directness, and rapidity' of the original. He is to be congratulated on having been able to carry out his design in its entirety. As a translation his work has great merit, the difficulty of providing an equivalent for each separate line being got over with remarkable ability. 'Metre of the original' must be taken with a qualification, since accent is avowedly substituted for quantity as the primary basis of the verse, though much attention is at the same time given to quantitative values.

There is no attempt at a 'homometric' rendering, as in the case of Cayley's *Iliad*.

A preface of some twenty pages deals mainly with metre. All forms of verse involving rhyme are pronounced unsuitable for his purpose, and a brief examination of others brings him to the 'hexameter,' which is discussed from what may be called an Arnoldian point of view. Little is said about the history of the metre in English, though Sidney and Stanihurst are quoted to show the futility of quantitative verse; recent attempts by one of our chief living poets are not mentioned at all, unless included in the 'few rather grotesque and unreadable experiments' with which the name of Spedding is specially associated (p. xiii). Mr Cotterill says he does not know against what 'barbarous experiments' Tennyson's lines were directed. If he will refer to the *Cornhill Magazine* for December, 1863, where these lines first appeared, he will find a note showing clearly that the reference was to translations of the *Iliad* by Herschel and others. I confess to having but lately discovered this myself. In the absence of any explanation (for this note was not reprinted[1]) I assumed—as grammar surely entitled one to assume—that '*these* lame hexameters' meant such ones as the poet was writing, and my only doubt was to what German verse allusion was made. The note leaves all clear. Tennyson's satire was aimed at the lumbering accentual hexameters popularized by Voss, Goethe, and Schiller, and copied by Whewell, Herschel, and others; and he cast his protest into a form different from theirs, which he never used again, and ultimately pronounced 'only fit for comic verse.'

Mr Cotterill refers to some renderings from Homer which appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* for 1846, but does not seem aware that the signature 'N. N. T.' denoted the last letters of their writer's names (John Gibson Lockhart), just as 'M. L.' denoted those of William Whewell, also mentioned. His averment that Lockhart's lines influenced Longfellow's choice of a metre for *Evangeline* needs confirmation, since Longfellow had used this metre several years before in *The Children of the Lord's Supper*, translated from Tegnér, and was certainly familiar with German models.

The preface repudiates the notion of there being anything un-English or unintelligible in the chosen rhythm, and cites once more as a perfect accentual hexameter the oft-quoted

> How art thou fallen from Heav'n, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning!

And indeed such cadences are perfectly common in our prose and verse; a Luciferian advocate might urge that they are too common, citing in proof such other lines as

> Dearest Louise, how delightful to bring young people together!

The argument is inconclusive either way, and shows merely that the cadences are there to be used, if they can be used to advantage. 'Iambic' accentual cadence is still more common in our speech, still

[1] It may now be read in the annotations to the 'Eversley' edition of the poet's works.

more fit for base as well as noble uses, but a long succession of poets has explored its capabilities, moulded it into various verse-forms, and developed these on truly English lines. The rhythmical movement which is utilised by 'hexameter' verse, on the other hand, was more sparingly handled by our earlier poets, and the particular form of it now in question has seldom been written except in imitation of a supposed ancient prototype. Its natural tendencies, its native excellences and defects, have never had free play. It has rarely if ever been written as a natural English metre, obeying only the laws of English prosody.

Mr Cotterill rightly condemns the accentualists' too frequent disregard of syllabic quantity. His ideal is summed up in the following rules (p. xv). '(1) The accents (stresses) should fall naturally and strongly on the syllables that occupy the places that the "longs" occupy in the old metre. Such a syllable should itself be, as far as possible, long, heavy, emphatic, or weighted with *meaning* when somewhat short in pronunciation. (2) The syllables occupying the places of the "shorts" should be, as far as possible, short, light, unemphatic. (3) The true spondee should be used, especially for the second and fourth feet. The trochee should be eschewed.' As a first sketch of metre, these canons are excellent, except that the third ignores the extent to which, in English verse, silent intervals may count in scansion, as does the caesural pause in that other noble line:

> God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet.

Good English verse does not depend merely on counting and weighing syllables. These rules, however, guard against many pitfalls, particularly against the fictitious stresses to which less careful writers are prone. Weak initial syllables are notably rare in this volume. The normal run of the verse is trisyllabic, varied by occasional spondees which are usually compound words such as 'broad-brow'd,' 'swift-wing'd,' 'knee-joint.' A short extract will serve as sample, taken from the beginning of Book XIII, as it is by the second twelve Books that the author wishes his metre to be judged.

> Thus did he end; and they sat all utterly silent and speechless,
> Holden as 'twere by a spell in the shadowy hall of the palace.
> Then King Alcinous outspake and in answer addressed him:
> 'Since now under the roof of my bronze-floored palace, Odysseus,
> Safe thou art come, thou'lt never, methinks, go wandering further,
> Ere to thy home thou return'st, however to hardship accustomed.
> Now to you all and to each I announce this further injunction,
> Each who is wont to partake of the glowing wine of the elders
> Here in my banqueting-hall, and to list to the song of the minstrel:
> Lo, in a polished coffer the raiment received by the stranger
> Lieth, and fair things fashioned of gold, and the rest of the presents,
> Which Phaeacian lords of the council collected together.
> Come, let us also present him a full-sized tripod and cauldron,
> Each of us; then can we later, by making collection in public,
> Win us repayment; 'tis hard when the one does favours for nothing.'

This is a specimen of ordinary narrative. The verse is rather less trisyllabic than usual. The first line is hard to scan, since neither 'end

and they' nor 'they sat all' makes a good dactyl, nor would 'sat all' be a satisfactory spondee. In the eighth line, 'glowing' is an accentual trochee. The twelfth line begins with a weak syllable for once, 'which' not being interrogative. The name Alcinous is to be pronounced *A'lcino-ús*. This license is frequently used in names like Telemachus, Eurymedon, Hermione, etc., and will puzzle English readers, while others will instinctively expect rules of quantity to be followed, and will be put out by 'Alcinoūs outspake,' 'Telemachūs addressing.' If Arete or Tydides be a molossus, they will wonder to find Aĕgisthus, and not to find Philōctētes. Apart from proper names, too, the reliance on syllable-quantity in some cases and disregard of it in others is somewhat confusing, so that after getting accustomed to real spondees one begins to ask whether 'shadowy' is a proper dactyl or 'palace' a proper trochee, and whether 'arrogant suitors,' 'savages wanton,' 'roseate-fingered' are euphonious dipodies. The contrast jars. Quantity is not so much 'counterpointed' to accent as brought into sharp collision with it. Verse that is based sometimes on quantity alone, sometimes on accent alone, will be apt to fall between the two stools. This from the merely metrical standpoint; but other aspects need consideration.

Rapid, simple, and direct—Matthew Arnold claims these qualities for Homer's verse, but adds a fourth; it is also noble. 'Never for a moment,' he says to the wouldbe translator, 'suffer yourself to forget our fourth fundamental proposition, *Homer is noble*.' Mr Cotterill seems to think that this is put too absolutely, and would have us recognise many different levels of Homeric diction (p. xvii, footnote). When the killing of a pig is described, or even the getting ready a boat for sailing, it would certainly be absurd to expect elevated language; yet, as he truly says, the description never 'sinks into banality.' And one thing may fairly be claimed from every translator of the *Odyssey*, that he shall make us feel we are reading a great poem. No translation is really faithful which does not give that impression; much inadequacy otherwise will be pardoned in one that does. Pope, with all his faults, gives it in his bravura passages; Maginn, *pace* Arnold, gives it in the best of his ballad versions; Worsley gives it in the lingering lusciousness of Spenserian stanza. How far does this new translation meet the test? Not, I think, in the passages of highest elevation, in the lines that describe the home of the gods or the Elysian land that is to receive Menelaus, in the interview between Odysseus and his mother, in the great scene where Odysseus reveals himself to the suitors. It is best in more pedestrian passages, in lines like

> Set was already the sun, and darkened was every roadway,

or in the ship *cliché*:

> Raising the pine-wood mast to its height, in the notch of the cross-bar
> Firmly they fixed it, and bracing it taut to the prow with the forestays
> Hoisted the fair white sails with the ropes tight-twisted of oxhide.

Such lines carry us pleasantly along, and the immortal story unfolds itself in them without intrusion of an alien personality. They should be

read in bulk, rather than in detached portions. A noteworthy letter by the late Alexander Macmillan, quoted near the end of the preface, shows how easily a non-classical ear accepts such verse, and would welcome 'a powerful and effective metre analogous to the hexameter and suited to the genius of the English language.' This latter we shall probably not get till some poet of the first rank takes it in hand. Longfellow, Clough, and Kingsley—not to mention lesser lights—were hardly strong enough for the task. Perhaps in Swinburne's 'Evening on the Broads' some hints and premonitions for such a freer treatment may be found. As yet, it must be confessed, we have hardly got beyond mere versifying; the bones are not clothed with flesh and blood. Even so, however, English readers take kindly enough to verse of this kind, and Mr Cotterill's translation should be acceptable to many. While hardly capable of being used as a *crib*, it keeps wonderfully close to the original, and adds no factitious graces. Whether it adequately reproduces the 'surge and thunder of the *Odyssey*' may be more open to question.

Scholarly exactness of rendering is noticeable throughout. But in III, 450, does not ὀλόλυξαν mean a solemn sacrificial cry rather than merely 'wailing'? In V, 281, regret may be felt that the 'shield' meaning of ῥινόν is discarded. In *ibid.*, 428, Odysseus is made 'suddenly forward to dart'—this when he was being carried along on a wave—but is rightly shown as clutching 'a boulder,' not 'the rock.' Surely the sense is that he hastily (ἐπεσσύμενος) grasped some outlying projection, and so escaped being dashed against the cliff; then, when torn from his hold by the receding wave, he must have dived through or under the next breaker, so as to rise (ἐξαναδύς) on its further side and swim along to the river-mouth. VIII, 124, is literally translated, but hardly seems to make sense, since 'the length of a furrow that mules might draw in a fallow' is not a definite measure of any kind; may not the reference be to mules as compared with oxen? In XII, 89, Scylla's twelve feet are merely 'waving suspended'; surely ἄωροι means more than this, though its exact signification may be doubtful. The plan of the Homeric palace (p. xxi) makes an ingenious contribution to a difficult problem by placing both the two 'thresholds' and the 'postern' at the lower end of the great hall, with a covered way on each side leading to the armoury and sleeping chambers. On this showing, Odysseus would shoot from the lower end, guarding the exit, as certainly seems probable. On the other hand, it is difficult to see why (XXIII, 88) Penelope should have gone round by the covered way instead of descending into the hall by the stairs at the upper end.

The figures in the illustrations seem hardly so successful as the landscapes, and are not always in keeping with the text. Why is the 'good old swineherd' made so youthful-looking on his first appearance? Why are the Sirens perched high on a rock, and did Homer conceive of them as winged? The Cyclops is a veritable 'man-mountain,' whom no cave could well have contained. 'The arrival at Ithaca' is finely designed, but the cliffs seem almost too imposing for reality.

The publishers deserve great credit for the way in which this sumptuous edition has been got up, and it will be strange if a cheaper popular one is not soon called for by students and general readers.

T. S. Omond.

Tunbridge Wells.

Frederick James Furnivall: A Volume of Personal Record. London: Frowde. 1911. 8vo. lxxxiv + 215 pp.

This volume is a tribute of the best kind to the memory of one who not only did work which is known to all the world in one particular department of literary scholarship, but also threw himself with characteristic energy into every kind of human interest which lay in his path, and made friends in the most diverse quarters by his ever active sympathy and his impulsive readiness to help where help was needed. The book consists of a biography by Mr John Munro, and a series of 'Memories of F. J. Furnivall' written by a number of those who knew him or were associated with him in his varied activities. Mr Munro's biography is simply and truthfully written, as its subject would have desired. He presents the picture in its entirety, and does not omit or slur over the faults which led sometimes to regrettable episodes of violence in controversy, or to ill-considered and hasty action—faults which sprang from the same impulsiveness and the same eager irrepressible spirit which lay at the root of his success.

The storms for which Furnivall was responsible in the early days of the Working Men's College illustrate, as his biographer says, 'a fact which was characteristic of Furnivall to the end, that he never succeeded in accommodating himself to the regulations and restrictions which every institution, necessarily dependent for its success upon compromise, imposes upon its members. He always succeeded best as an adventurer, proceeding by his own initiative, and unimpeded by the discretion and the reticence of more reflecting and calculating minds.' And again: 'He never understood, or attempted to understand, the quality of tact. It was a species of dishonesty. What he held to be true was to be enounced in the face of all opposition, with unfaltering directness and clarity; what he held to be false was to be denounced with Athanasian intensity and resolution.' The two sides of him are summed up at the end of Dr Henry Bradley's appreciation:

> Furnivall had faults, as we all have, and he concealed them less than most. Where he thought he saw empty pretence of knowledge, hypocrisy, or self-seeking under the mask of zeal for scholarship, he could be a bitter enemy; and his harsh judgements were not always just.....Many who knew little of him saw in him only a man of extravagant animosities and unbridled violence of expression. To me and to many others his name stands for an ardour of unselfish kindness and a laborious helpfulness to which we have known no parallel.

This book very happily exhibits the many-sided activity of its subject by the number and variety of the contributors to it, and by the different

points of view which are taken by them, all the accounts of him harmonising, however, in the impression which they give of one who threw himself into whatever work he thought worth doing with incomparable energy and enthusiasm, who was always fresh in mind and warm in heart, and who was constantly on the watch for opportunities of doing kindness. We have here memories contributed by scholars of many various countries, by literary men who were his friends, by men and women who were interested in the various kinds of social work into which he threw himself, by rowing men and sculling women, among the latter being a member of his dearly loved Hammersmith Sculling Club for Girls and Men, which above all things he desired to have kept up after his death, even by a waitress at the A.B.C. shop in New Oxford Street to which he came regularly for tea and to meet friends; and from them all combined we get a harmonious picture of one whose character was based mainly upon simplicity and enthusiasm.

Absolute unconventionality was of course one of his characteristics. 'He took me once to a matinée,' writes Miss Radford, 'and I suppose we must have forgotten to have an early enough lunch, or grown suddenly hungry in Bond Street, for down Bond Street we walked, buns in our hands, and he, the day being hot, with his hat also in his hand, and his only coat over his arm. I was at school in those days, and this attitude to Bond Street made an immense and beneficial impression upon me.' It was a dangerous thing to get him on the platform at a meeting, for you never knew what he might not say; and there are several amusing instances recorded of irrelevant outbursts on politics or theology which made chairmen very uncomfortable, though no doubt they highly amused the unregenerate among the audience.

Social barriers he simply refused to recognise, and nothing moved his anger so much as the 'snobbishness' which excluded from the status of amateur in rowing those who got their living by manual labour. Mr Propert in this book tells the story of his agitation in favour of altering the rule, and the founding in connexion with this of the National Amateur Rowing Association.

In reviewing this book it is difficult not to slide into the vein of personal reminiscence. The present writer's memories of Furnivall go back further than most of those that are recorded in this volume. My first meeting with him was some time in the earlier seventies in Henry Bradshaw's rooms at Cambridge, and it was amusing to note the contrast between the two men, Furnivall insisting that Bradshaw must and should do some piece of work which he was specially qualified to do, and Bradshaw opposing a gently humorous placidity, which was more hopeless than any refusal, and which to Furnivall, I am afraid, seemed to indicate mere senseless obstinacy. For him it was everything to get texts printed somehow, for the sake of bringing them out and making them available. Bradshaw probably was not sorry that this should be done, but he was constitutionally incapable of working in this manner himself. After this I met Furnivall only at long intervals, but in later

years I used to hear from him pretty frequently, not only on matters of scholarship, and like so many others I have to thank him for very real help and kindness.

The book before us is intended to supply a picture of the man, rather than an appreciation of his work as a scholar, and this aim it admirably accomplishes. At the same time it would ill become a writer upon it in the *Modern Language Review* to close without a word of hearty acknowledgement of Furnivall's services to English scholarship. There have been many better scholars, but none probably whose work has more effectually contributed to progress, and without the publications of the Early English Text Society the material for the Oxford Dictionary would have been grievously incomplete. It must not be forgotten, moreover, that it was Furnivall who in early days fought the battle of the Philological Society's Dictionary, and that without him it might never have come to the birth. Chaucer scholarship owes almost all its new materials to his work and influence, and the New Shakspere Society laid the foundations of almost all that we know about the metrical characteristics of the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists. It was Furnivall's merit to discern in all these cases what needed to be done, and by his energy and contagious enthusiasm to induce bodies of subscribers and of competent workers to help him to carry it through. Professor Ker says of him very justly:

> His work as a student was another example of what is fortunately not rare in England, the pursuit and the diffusion of knowledge, apart from any elaborate organization of research. Much of the best historical work in England has been done by unprofessional hands, and Furnivall worked as an independent adventurer. No doubt his work had many of the faults which are prevented in the best regulated schools, but it had always the spring and energy of a life unimpeded by routine.... Those who saw him as he drew near the end of his voyage are glad to think of him as unconquered, retaining to the last all the devotion to learning in which he had lived, and all his confidence in the regard of his friends.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

West Riding Place-Names. By F. W. Moorman. Publications of the Thoresby Society. Leeds. 1910. 8vo. lvi + 215 pp.

The number of monographs on English place-names grows apace and Dr Moorman's volume on those of the West Riding is not the least valuable or interesting of the works which have appeared. The study of place-names may be attacked from various points of view and in this respect Dr Moorman's book stands in sharp contrast to a work which appeared almost at the same time, *The Place-names of Lancashire*, by Professor Wyld and Dr Hirst. The authors of this rigidly confine themselves to the philological aspect of the study of place-names and refuse of set purpose to consider any of those questions, social, historical and mythological which are of such perennial interest to the lay mind curious as to the meaning of the names of places, and

more especially strange names of places, with which it happens to be familiar. Dr Moorman on the other hand while determining his derivations and explanations in accordance with strict philological law, does much valuable work in endeavouring to discover the human interest behind those explanations, and trying to show what was the exact meaning of a place-name as originally applied and how far that name is suitable to the particular locality. In a long and interesting preface he sums up the results obtained by his methods and shows what light they throw collectively not only on the salient facts of our past history but also on such vexed questions as the nature of the early Teutonic settlements, their organisation and their social distinctions. At times Dr Moorman's interest in the popular aspect of his study leads him to adopt a manner which is not quite worthy of his own sound scholarship, but for his work as a whole we owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

In the explanation of difficult place-names the author often errs on the side of giving too many possible alternatives. It is right not to be dogmatic when evidence is scant or conflicting, but at times unnecessary and even impossible alternative explanations are offered in cases of this kind. For example, O.N. *Ulfadalr* (p. 211) could not have given Wooldale: the alternative explanation of Sleningford as O.E. *Slegenaford* is gratuitous; the evidence of the old records, with the exception of Domesday Book, is unanimous, and Dr Moorman would himself be the first to admit that we must not coin fresh forms to explain the vagaries of Domesday Book: the second and third alternatives for Selby (p. 165) are unnecessary and do not meet the full facts of the case: the O.E. form *Hunsigesora* as an alternative explanation of Hunsingore (p. 106) is phonetically impossible: the Domesday spelling *s* for *sc* is so common that there is no need to suggest O.E. *Easttun* as an explanation of the form *Estune* = Mod. Eshton. At times these alternative explanations involve interesting questions in place-nomenclature, but they tend to confuse the immediate issues, at least to the non-philological mind.

In the Old Norse personal names, so common in the West Riding place-names, one or two points may be noticed. The O.N. cognate of O.E. *Guthlac* is *Guthleikr* not *Guthlaug* (p. 79). *Cowthorpe* and *Colton* going back to O.E. *Coletorp* and *Coletun* (pp. 49 and 52) should be derived from Norse *Koli* rather than *Kolli*: cf. O.N. *Kolathorp* now *Kultorp* in Norway itself. The old forms of Ingerthorpe would suggest O.N. *Ingríðr* rather than *Ingvarr* and it should be pointed out that the real name of the murderer of St Edmund was not *Ingvarr* or *Yngvarr* but *Ívarr*. The form *Hinguar* in the Chronicle is due to confusion between the two names. The name *Kouthmundr* (p. 50) is not recognised in Lind's Dictionary of Norse-Icelandic names.

In some few other cases one cannot agree with the etymologies suggested. The name of the river Sheaf on which Sheffield stands is much younger than the name of the town (at least it would seem so from the records) and a river with an English name is always a matter of suspicion. The name of the river is probably derived from that of the town (cf. the river Penk from Penkridge in Staffs.). Drax (p. 61) can

hardly be from O.E. *Dragas* (pl. of *Dræg*) as that would become Mod. E. Draws. In the interpretation of names it is difficult always to see how they could come to have the force given them by Dr Moorman. It is not clear how O.E. *wīc-dūn* could come to mean 'the farm on a hill' or *wīc-healh* 'a farm situated in a corner of a field': the first element must qualify the second rather than the second the first.

These criticisms do not affect the value of the book as a whole, and are only offered because it is to be hoped that it will prove a stimulus to similar work in other counties, and the conclusions arrived at in one county must always prove helpful in another. One must not conclude this notice without a word of high praise for Mr C. J. Battersby, who has furnished some very valuable additional notes and explanations, dealing more especially with names of Scandinavian origin.

Allen Mawer.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Die Deklination in der Nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift. (Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie.) Von H. C. A. Carpenter. Bonn: Hanstein. 1910. 8vo. xvi + 320 pp.

This lengthy work is essentially part of a scheme instituted by the editor of the series. In dealing with the Lindisfarne Glosses investigators have been accustomed to consider separately each of the gospels, together with its accompanying preface and rubrics; but it is now thought that an exhaustive examination of all the English portions, taken as a whole, will lead to results of greater value. To render this scheme the more practical, it has been further proposed that such an investigation shall be carried out in a series of four monographs, which shall deal successively with the accented vowels, the unaccented vowels and consonants, the declensions, and the conjugations.

Dr Carpenter, whose book thus fills the third place in the scheme, is second in the field, his predecessor being W. Stolz, whose dissertation on the accented vowels appeared in 1907. This fact makes it all the more surprising that Dr Carpenter should have thought it relevant to begin with a discussion of three questions, the bearing of which on his subject (in accordance with the scheme) seems all too remote. But still more curious is it that he should have thought it worth while debating, on palaeographical grounds, the likelihood of the glosses being the work of a single author, because he has really nothing fresh to say here. His remarks consist mainly in a long extract from the well-known 'Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum,' in the reproduction of which the size of the type is responsible for some misprints; he then modestly informs us that he agrees with the results given by the authors of the Catalogue, 'ohne mich auf tiefere paläographische Kenntnisse stützen zu können,' thus leaving the question in precisely the same state as before. He then deals briefly with questions

arising out of the date of the glosses, and with the varying forms of the letter *a*. Here again there is little to command attention. Nobody requires to be told that such variations of form do not indicate any phonetic distinctions, and it was hardly necessary to invoke the aid of an eminent scholar to destroy this mare's nest.

Still dealing with preliminaries, Dr Carpenter then considers three matters, more germane to his main subject, beginning with a discussion of the many forms where final letters or syllables are either indicated by signs of contraction or else omitted altogether. Cases where the missing syllable represents an inflexion are naturally his chief concern, and he attempts to show that, in the majority of instances, the omitted ending is linguistically justifiable. The other instances he calls 'crude forms,' using a term which ought to be left to Sanskrit grammarians of the old school. All this is very slippery ground, but our author makes brave efforts to keep his balance, and he may win approval from some. But the very existence of any 'crude forms' must of necessity tell against his argument, because it proves that whoever wrote the glosses was not unfamiliar with the practice of rendering a Latin word by its English equivalent, without regard to the context. The vowels of the case-endings are next treated, although they might have been safely left to an ally, filling the second place in the scheme, who would have been in a position to look at the whole question from a necessarily wider point of view. Having quoted some of Lindelöf's remarks on the fluctuations of gender—a feature of the dialect—Dr Carpenter finally discusses, with all detail, variations exhibited by given case-endings, adding statistics. The results of the First Part are summarized on half a page (p. 97), and it is not altogether Dr Carpenter's fault if they seem disproportionate to the labour expended upon them.

This brings Dr Carpenter to his Second Part, which is an exhaustive statement of the case-forms assumed in declension by all words capable of undergoing the process, a sign being added after each form to indicate the frequency of its occurrence. The declensions are set forth after the manner usual in scientific grammars of Old English, and room has been found for the inclusion of adverbs, prepositions, and so on. In certain of the nominal declensions, the well-known irregularities and fluctuations of gender and case-forms render difficult any attempt at a rigid classification, but Dr Carpenter meets the problem fairly by taking as his standard normal Old English usage. Using this as a basis of comparison, he is able to class all differences as new formations. To each declension is prefixed a list of the words there treated, and forms from other texts are freely quoted, for the purpose of comparison. All doubtful points are fully discussed in notes, with abundant references. It is apparent that Dr Carpenter, while availing himself of the current literature, does not accept the statements of his predecessors blindly. Moreover, the lack of a treatise has obliged him to conduct his own investigations of the necessary portions of St Matthew. At all points he is able to adduce the authority of the manuscript first-hand.

For these reasons, the Second Part of the book, both as a valuable rearrangement of known facts and on account of new matter, will be found indispensable by all whom it may concern. It is doubtful, however, whether they will be content with Dr Carpenter's favourite method of explanation, which takes the form of a direct appeal to the authority of a series of reconstructed languages, beginning with Primitive Old Anglian and ending with Indo-Germanic. These tongues seem to have enjoyed a profusion of alternative forms ('Nebenformen'); wherefore the number of asterisks in the book is considerable.

A. O. Belfour.

Belfast.

Beon und Wesan: eine syntaktische Untersuchung. Von Karl Jost. (Anglistische Forschungen.) Heidelberg: Winter. 1909. 8vo. vi + 141 pp.

In this study an attempt is made to distinguish between the functions of *bēon* and *wesan* in the Old English period, and, to some extent, in Early Middle English. Emphasis is laid, at the outset, upon the principle enunciated by Behagel 'dass gleichwertige Formen von der Sprache niemals auf die Dauer beibehalten werden: entweder geht die eine der Formen unter, oder sie werden—ohne bewusste Absicht natürlich—in ihrer Bedeutung differenziert.' Other investigators, such as Grimm, Koch, Mätzner and Nader, have felt the need of a distinction, but have usually contented themselves with the generalisation, that *bēon* has future force, while *wesan* is limited to the present.

Dr Jost rightly selects two chief texts for detailed investigation, the prose *Cura Pastoralis* and *Beowulf*. Some attention is also given to other poetical texts of the Old English period, to Ælfric, and finally to early monuments of Middle English.

The important distinction between 'abstract' and 'concrete' sentences—fundamental to the investigation—is borrowed from Paul: 'Ich verstehe hier und im folgenden unter einem Konkretum immer etwas, was als real existierend gesetzt wird, an bestimmte Schranken des Raumes und der Zeit gebunden; unter einem Abstraktum einen allgemeinen Begriff, blossen Vorstellungsinhalt an sich, losgelöst von räumlicher und zeitlicher Begrenzung.' The generalisation appears at the same time to the effect that sentences with *bēon* are abstract, sentences with *wesan* concrete or concrete-abstract. But the matter cannot be so easily settled, as Dr Jost is well aware, and he at once admits that from the purely temporal point of view *bēon* often has a special future force, cf. *Beowulf*, l. 1762, etc. There follow examples of the 'concrete' e.g. l. 2539 Gebide ge on beorge...Nis þæt ower siđ; of the 'abstract' e.g. l. 2541 ne-biđ swylc earges siđ.

The *Cura Pastoralis* causes more difficulty and necessitates more careful distinctions, since *bēon* is found in both 'abstract' and 'concrete' sentences, and similarly with *wesan*. Dr Jost makes an ingenious and,

on the whole, a successful attempt to explain the apparent inconsistencies. *Bēon* is used in 'abstract' sentences particularly when the subject is a person, 'Yfle preostas bioð folces hryre': in hypothetical sentences, 'Gif ðonne ægðer bið unwis ðonne is to geðencanne hwæt Crist self cuæð': and in combination with temporal adverbs, 'oft for ðæs lareowes wisdome unwisum hieremonnum bið geborgen.' In 'concrete' sentences it has future, present-future, or iterative force. The various functions of *wesan* are treated equally fully.

Some difficulty occurs in connection with such an example as the following from *Orosius*, 'Þæt Estland is swyðe micel, ond Þær bið swyðe manig burh' along with others where Sweet renders by the present tense. Further, the forms are not equally distributed in the various dialects, while in Middle English there is a general substitution of the plural form *sind* in favour of *beoð*.

Dr Jost's treatment is throughout psychological, and he shows no signs of wishing to slur over examples which make against his theory.

P. G. Thomas.

London.

The Romantic Movement in French Literature. By H. F. Stewart and A. A. Tilley. Cambridge: The University Press. 1910. 8vo. xi + 242 pp.

Depuis quelques années le Romantisme n'a pas une bonne presse. Il est vrai que la reprise, à la Comédie Française, de certains drames flamboyants de Hugo, comme *Ruy Blas* et *Marion Delorme*, a obtenu récemment un certain succès auprès du gros public, mais à part quelques exceptions (au nombre desquelles il convient de citer surtout M. Maigron) les critiques se montrent généralement hostiles, souvent même grincheux ou injustes (cf. le livre de M. Pierre Lasserre sur *Le Romantisme Français*).

Il semble pourtant bien difficile, sinon impossible, de ne pas reconnaître la valeur considérable des écrivains que le Romantisme a produits —les Hugo, les Ste Beuve, les Balzac etc. 'Et quel temps fut jamais si fertile en...génies?' Aucune époque—pas même le grand siècle—n'en a vu naître davantage ni de plus grands—ni dont l'influence ait porté plus loin.

Comment donc expliquer l'hostilité persistante des 'habiles'? Et comment réconcilier les tares de l'école et son inéluctable déchéance avec l'éclat de ses principaux représentants? Comment les œuvres peuvent-elles être durables si les principes qui les ont inspirées étaient viciés dans leurs origines? Il y aurait sans doute beaucoup à dire là-dessus. MM. Stewart et Tilley ont bien vu que 'the critics aim rather at the movement itself than at the individual writers.' Ce qui nous semble insupportable aujourd'hui, c'est tout ce que le Romantisme contenait d'anormal et de monstrueux, c'est l'hyperesthésie, l'exaspération du moi, la sensiblerie maladive, larmoyante et déclamatoire des

'privilégiés de la souffrance,' l'exhibition éhontée de leurs misères morales et physiologiques.

Tout cela est maintenant bien mort, et méritait de mourir—mais à côté de ces éléments morbides, il y a toute une partie saine, durable—humaine et éternelle comme la Vie elle-même—qu'on pourrait appeler, paradoxalement peut-être, la partie *classique* du romantisme, si l'on convient d'appeler *classique* toute œuvre qui réunit le particulier et le général, l'éphémère et le permanent. M. Deschanel a jadis publié deux volumes sur le Romantisme des classiques. Ce serait une tâche facile et intéressante d'étudier le classicisme des Romantiques, de montrer que personne n'a exprimé avec plus de splendeur verbale que Hugo, avec plus de profondeur ni d'amertume que Vigny, avec plus de voluptueuse langueur que Lamartine, les grands lieux communs qui sont à la base de toutes les littératures, parcequ'ils forment le fonds moral de l'humanité—l'amour, la nature, la mort, et cette 'angoisse métaphysique' 'qui fait frissonner l'homme en voyant l'Infini.' Pascal l'avait dit avant Musset, et plus fortement. C'est par là, par cette identité ou cette coïncidence de l'Individuel et de l'Universel, que les deux écoles se rejoignent, et que toutes deux dureront.

Les auteurs du petit volume que nous avons sous les yeux ont eu pour but de faciliter aux jeunes gens l'étude de la littérature Romantique, de ses origines, ses éléments, son évolution.

Pour cela, ils ont tiré des principaux ouvrages théoriques de l'époque un certain nombre d'extraits caractéristiques, et de valeur durable, sur des points de doctrine ou d'histoire littéraire et les ont reliés ensemble par des exposés et de courtes discussions, en anglais, de façon à former un tout homogène, à éviter le décousu qui est trop souvent le défaut capital de ce genre de publications. Beaucoup des documents qu'ils ont utilisés sont difficilement accessibles, surtout hors de France, et MM. Stewart et Tilley ont rendu un véritable service aux étudiants anglais en les mettant à leur portée sous une forme compacte et pratique.

Leur volume, malgré ses dimensions restreintes (242 pages seulement) représente des lectures étendues et un travail considérable de sélection; devant une telle abondance de matériaux, leur tâche a dû être à la fois longue et difficile, et a nécessité beaucoup de tact et de mesure. Je dois reconnaître qu'ils s'en sont fort bien acquittés, et que leur choix est admirablement fait. Tous les passages qu'ils ont imprimés étaient essentiels, et parmi ceux qu'ils ont rejetés il serait difficile d'en citer plus d'un ou deux qui conservent encore aujourd'hui leur intérêt et leur portée et dont l'omission semble regrettable.

Par exemple, j'avoue ma déception de n'avoir pas trouvé—à côté des 33 pages de *De l'Allemagne*—un seule page du *Génie du Christianisme*, pas même la théorie si originale sur les conceptions païenne et chrétienne de la nature.

La mythologie rapetissait la nature...' c'est le christianisme qui, en chassant ces petites divinités des bois et des eaux, a seul rendu au poète la liberté de représenter les déserts dans leur majesté primitive.'

Désormais, 'libres de ce troupeau de dieux ridicules qui les bornaient de toutes parts, les bois se sont remplis d'une divinité immense....'

Tout ce passage, et deux ou trois autres semblables (malgré les justes restrictions qu'ils comportent et que Fontanes formula dès l'apparition du *Génie*), me semblent contenir en germe le vague panthéisme des premiers romantiques, et à ce titre méritaient peut-être d'être cités.

J'ai regretté aussi de ne pas trouver, à côté de plusieurs passages tirés de la *Muse Française*, un seul extrait du *Globe*. Il eût pourtant été intéressant de montrer le rôle important de ce journal dans la bataille romantique. Les classiques avaient eu, au début, la bonne fortune de profiter d'un malentendu qui provenait du contraste entre les opinions politiques et les opinions littéraires. Les premiers romantiques (Lamartine, Hugo) furent révolutionnaires en littérature, mais monarchistes en politique, et catholiques en religion. Le public, au contraire, était libéral et voltairien. Il fut donc réactionnaire en littérature. Il aurait volontiers donné gain de cause aux romantiques, mais leurs doctrines politiques et religieuses, le *droit divin*, le *trône et l'autel* etc., lui répugnaient. Ce malentendu ne cessa qu'en 1824, et ce fut le *Globe* qui y mit fin. Il se montra à la fois libéral et romantique, et grâce à la fermeté et à l'unité de sa direction, il acquit très vite une grande influence sur le public comme sur les hommes de lettres, et réussit à faire comprendre aux deux partis l'inconséquence et l'incohérence de leur attitude. Tout cela est, il est vrai, indiqué à la page 59 du livre de MM. Stewart et Tilley, mais en passant, négligemment, et, me semble-t-il, d'une façon peu claire. Il y aurait eu intérêt à préciser la question, à la faire toucher du doigt, pour ainsi dire, en donnant un ou deux extraits du *Globe*. Puisque nous parlons de la bataille romantique, était-il bien nécessaire de fixer une date précise? Et, dans ce cas, n'est-ce pas reculer un peu tard que de la faire commencer en 1824? (p. viii). Ou bien faut-il attribuer quelque importance à un personnage aujourd'hui oublié, M. de St Chamans, que M. de Feletz osa comparer à Pascal, et dont le Pamphlet *l'Anti-Romantique* (1818) aurait jeté le premier cri de guerre[1]? C'est d'ailleurs un détail insignifiant, que je me contente de signaler pour mémoire. Un dernier point: les auteurs ont donné les trois dernières préfaces des *Odes et Ballades* (1824, 1826, 1828) mais ont rejeté les deux premières (juin et décembre 1822). Pourquoi? Ce ne pouvait être pour économiser de la place. Les deux ensemble ont à peine deux pages. La première contient la fameuse définition de la poésie, terminée par la phrase souvent citée: *La Poésie est tout ce qu'il y a d'intime dans tout.* Cela ne suffisait-il pas à en justifier l'inclusion?

Mais ce sont là des vétilles. Et ce serait futilité aussi que d'ergoter à propos du 'platonic attachment' de Lamartine pour Madame Charles (p. 40). Les auteurs ont preféré là-dessus l'opinion de M. Séché à celle de M. Faguet[2], et ce n'est pas moi qui les en blâmerai. L'important,

[1] Cf. P. Albert, *La littérature au XIX^e siècle*, i, p. 27.
[2] Cf. E. Faguet, *Amours d'hommes de lettres.*

c'est que leur collaboration a produit un volume intéressant, plein de faits, d'une information solide et sûre, qu'on ne saurait recommander trop chaudement à tous ceux qui s'intéressent à la littérature française, et qui sera tout simplement indispensable aux étudiants de nos universités.

H. E. Berthon.

Oxford.

Moore en France. Contribution à l'histoire de la fortune des œuvres de Thomas Moore, dans la littérature française, 1819—1830. Par Allen Burdett Thomas. Paris: Champion. 1911. 8vo. xii + 171 pp.

This thesis, which has gained its author the degree of 'Doctor of the University of Lyons' is a fair example of what a thesis ought not to be. We regret that the University of Lyons, whose teaching has hitherto been rightly regarded as both efficient and thorough, has accepted a dissertation which, in our opinion, is a futile attempt at criticism. It will be well, however, to bear in mind that a 'University Doctorate'—which should be carefully distinguished from a 'Doctorat-ès-Lettres'—is by no means an unimpeachable guarantee of the holder's scholarship; the diploma itself is not one of the necessary qualifications expected from French Lecturers and Professors, it is mostly confined to foreign graduates who have thus first-rate opportunities of improving their knowledge of the language by a well-directed course of reading, and, as has often been the case, of making noteworthy additions to the study of French Literature or Romance Philology. The value of the 'Doctorat d'Université' is altogether relative and candidates not infrequently fail to attain a high standard of merit[1].

The substance of Mr Thomas's thesis is very thin and might easily be summed up in a highly serviceable article, say, of ten pages; the author has doubtless taken great pains in collecting his information and his conscientious industry in perusing twenty-one periodicals and various other documents may be unreservedly commended; but the critical analysis of the reasons which caused Moore to be ranked by his romantic admirers immediately below Scott and Byron, is buried under a mass of undigested knowledge. The numerous facts which Mr Thomas has left to take care of themselves are placed on one and the same plane; incongruous details and irrelevant evidence point to a distinct lack of that sense of proportion which alone would have enabled the author to tell what mattered from what did not. In a work of this kind, which is apparently meant to deal with the influence of Moore's poetry on French Romanticism, it is not enough to gather together materials, which is what any of us could do; the materials

[1] It may be useful to know that 23 students are at present reading in Paris for the Doctorat-ès-Lettres and 78 for the Doctorat d'Université.

must be intelligently sifted and interpreted—and this is what the present author has not done.

The two most important chapters ('Moore and the French Literary Press,' 'Moore's influence on French literature') mainly consist of wearisome extracts and lengthy quotations from reviews and prefaces. Mr Thomas has unhappily elected the chronological method and recorded the opinions of French critics, year by year and poem by poem; in other words, the reader must needs wade through some 150 pages of indifferent writing to come to the conclusion that Moore's poems, especially *Lalla Rookh*, the *Loves of the Angels* and the *Irish Melodies*, enjoyed a brief spell of popularity which began in 1820 or thereabout and died out in the early thirties. A complete list of the articles brought out on Moore, of the French editions of his works, of contemporary translations and imitations would have told us as much; a well-drawn up appendix would have made short work of cumbersome summaries.

The author has however been occasionally obliged to resort to a less elementary method; even then his handling of facts remains clumsy and ineffective. In his first chapter, which is an exhaustive account of Moore's stays in Paris (1817, 1819–22) and of his travels in France, we hear that '*en vrai artiste* Moore visite tous les musées et toutes les églises des villes où il s'arrête' (p. 1), and that, at Lyons 'il est descendu à l'Hôtel de l'Europe' (p. 2). Whilst in the Metropolis, the Irish poet was often the guest of M^me^ la duchesse de Broglie, 'une dame bien plus célèbre' (p. 3) than his first hostess, M^me^ de Flahaut. He certainly met a great number of illustrious Frenchmen, though in most cases he has neglected to mention their names (p. 3). Moore's acquaintance with French literature must have been slight since, in an article published in the *Edinburgh Review* (what date?), 'il n'était pas à même de distinguer les grands écrivains des autres' (p. 5). The best proof is that he met Lamartine at M^me^ de Broglie's and never said anything about him. 'Lamartine, aurait-il été un de ces hommes réputés de grand talent dont il oublie les noms?' (pp. 3, 6) etc., etc. Finally, after making numerous acquaintances not only 'dans le grand monde, mais aussi parmi les acteurs, les auteurs, et les journalistes' (p. 11), Moore was given a farewell dinner by his English friends (Oct. 18, 1822) and was back in England on Nov. 18, 1823.

The irretrievable weakness of this thesis lies as well in the author's lack of critical insight as in his inadequate information. We thought that Rousseau and Bernardin de St Pierre had contributed something towards the making of Romantic diction; not so, indeed, for Chateaubriand 'est le grand initiateur en prose' (p. 27). We believed that V. Hugo's *Orientales* had been published in 1829 and Musset's *Contes d'Espagne et d'Italie* in 1830, but 'l'année 1825 semble marquer la fin de la période de popularité de cette poésie orientale' (p. 155), and the author sententiously adds 'C'est la tendance de l'âge, qui devient de plus en plus *scientifique* et positif' (p. 156 and p. 168). We had hitherto regarded Musset's *Namouna* as the firm protest of injured common sense.

Mr Thomas has studied the influence of Moore on French poets, more particularly on Vigny, Lamartine, V. Hugo and Leconte de Lisle. On the whole, we agree that Moore was, to a perhaps greater degree than Chateaubriand, Klopstock, Byron and Milton, responsible for those innumerable angels that lent their wings to early Romanticism (pp. 46, 132, 138). We agree that in *La Chute d'un Ange* 'la pensée de Lamartine ne doit rien à Moore' (p. 131). We do not know why the sound principle contained in the last statement came to be ignored in the case of Vigny[1]. We have lately heard too much about influence; we venture to hold that there is no influence whatever, that the word itself is wrongly used, as long as the recipient's thoughts remain entire and unaltered, as long, in fact, as his debt is solely one of words, images and metaphors[2]. 'Pour écrire un poème (Eloa) sur une telle donnée,' Mr Thomas writes, 'Vigny avait besoin d'une provision d'images pittoresques pour dépeindre le décor du ciel, et il lui fallait aussi des *renseignements sur les habitudes des êtres célestes*' (p. 110). Such a disastrous start inevitably led to a long list of verbal imitations (pp. 112—123 and foll.), from which we infer the one all-important thing which the author has omitted to point out and emphasize—namely, that Eloa does not owe one jot of its deeply human meaning to Moore's heavenly pageantry and literary frippery.

> Il pense qu'à la fin des temps évanouis
> Il lui faudra de même envisager son maître
> Et qu'un regard de Dieu le brisera peut-être[3].

The last line is Vigny's own, and Mr Thomas has failed to prove, as he expressly intended (p. 109), that Brunetière blunders when he 'déclare avec confiance' that '*Eloa* n'appartient certainement qu'à Vigny' (p. 109).

One more example of 'influence': Leconte de Lisle's *Nurmahal* has very little in common with Moore's[4]. 'Nous pourrions cependant remarquer que Leconte de Lisle introduit une "péri" dans son poème, Moore a beaucoup aimé les "péris"' (p. 154)[5].

The lack of space compels us to leave out minor defects such as repetitions and inconsistencies, and it will be enough to note that Mr Thomas' knowledge of French is anything but accurate and grammatical.

J. J. Champenois.

Oxford.

[1] Mr Thomas acknowledges his debt (p. 110) to Professor Baldensperger's article on 'Moore and Vigny,' published in this *Review*, in July, 1906.

[2] For a striking instance of actual influence, see Maréchal, on Lamennais and Lamartine.

[3] *Eloa*, 638 and foll., quoted as an imitation.

[4] This I take to be the meaning of 'Le *Nurmahal* de Leconte de Lisle...a très peu de ressemblance avec Moore' (*sic*).

[5] Since the author has mentioned Th. Gautier, we may refer him to *Avatar* (p. 32, Charpentier, 1891)...'Thomas Moore pourrait seul le dire en style d'amour des Anges,' and to *Jettatura* (p. 196, same vol.)...'Miss Alicia Ward, une délicieuse jeune fille, une créature céleste, un ange de Thomas Moore.'

An Introduction to the Study of Old High German. By Lionel Armitage. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1911. 8vo. 264 pp.

This book is divided into two parts as follows:

Part I falls into four short sections. It treats of the Classification of the Germanic Languages, gives a survey of the Old German Literary Monuments, Paradigms of the inflection of the Verb, Noun, Adjective and Pronoun; and explains the transcription and pronunciation of O.H.G.

Part II has seven chapters which treat successively of the Indo-germanic and Primitive Germanic Consonant Systems, the development of the Primitive Germanic Consonant System, the Old High German Consonant System (the High German Sound-shift, the Germanic Consonants in O.H.G.), the Vowel System (Primitive Germanic and its Development in O.H.G.), the Verbal System, the Nominal and Pronominal System, the Numerals and Adverbs. The book concludes with a Table of Old High German Verbs, a Bibliography and Indexes.

There is no syntax, and no systematic treatment of word-formation. It will be consequently seen that the main aim of this Introduction is to give firstly a comparative account of the phonology of O.H.G. and secondly an explanation of its inflectional system on a comparative basis. The novel feature of the book lies in this rigid application of the comparative method to Old High German grammar.

There is a good deal to be said in favour of introducing the beginner thus to his subject. Students who have received most of their previous grammatical training in connection with the Classical Languages, have, when they take up a highly inflected type of language like O.H.G., a natural bias towards comparing its structure with that of Latin and Greek; and in consequence the comparative manner of treatment renders more interesting and lively the tedious process of acquiring a new vocabulary and new paradigms. On the other hand grammars like that of Braune combine the descriptive method with a classification of the phenomena which is derived from comparative grammar without further explanation, the student being assumed to possess the knowledge already which renders such explanation superfluous. In the case of the English student previous knowledge of this sort is, however, very rare, and he is at a loss to understand, for example, why there should be a declension called that of the *a*-stems, when the words it contains show to him no visible sign of the *a* on which their classification is based. I agree fully with Mr Armitage's claim (in his Preface) that grammars of the German type are unsuitable for the English student at first, and consider that he has done the latter a good turn in producing a book which presents clearly and attractively the results of comparative grammar applied to the elucidation of the framework of the O.H.G. language. It must of course be admitted that it is an open question whether in spite of its undoubted attractiveness, the comparative standpoint is finally the best for the beginner, and whether it is not really better for him to start by acquiring a purely practical

knowledge of a given dialect, learning to read it fluently before dissecting its grammatical constitution and its relationship with cognate languages. The authorities are at variance in their practice. Dr Sweet, our leading master of the comparative and historical study of English, has for example not adopted the German method in his introductory books on Old English, which are strictly descriptive, and aim at the beginner's mastering the language practically as a preliminary to further study. The comparative standpoint has indeed for the beginner the danger that he may spend a great deal of time in studying linguistic forms without gaining any firsthand acquaintance with their employment as a means of expressing thought. It has the further drawback that while it can be applied within a reasonable compass to Phonology and Accidence, this is hardly the case with regard to Syntax, and the grammars of this particular sort are in this respect usually incomplete, like Mr Armitage's Introduction. When we consider however the uninspiring nature of the major portion of what is rather over-generously termed Old High German Literature, and the consequent lack of any exterior stimulus for the student towards the practical mastery of its language, we may probably conclude that in the case of this particular dialect we are practically constrained for pedagogical reasons to adopt, in its elementary grammars at least, either the purely comparative or mixed comparative-descriptive method. It is the task of the University lecturer to ensure that the student shall not rest content with the grammar but study the texts as well.

In the main, Mr Armitage has performed the task he set himself satisfactorily. He gives a clear and readable account of the laws of sound-change which explain the O.H.G. flectional and sound system, and he has focussed on his subject a great deal of information which the English student until now has had either to do without or seek for himself with much exertion in German books and periodicals.

It is a good feature that frequent references are given to specialistic literature; this whets curiosity and encourages a critical attitude of mind, two qualities in which the English student in his devotion to 'textbooks' and examinations is apt to be deficient. But the form in which the references are given is often careless: e.g. 'cp. Heusler' is not sufficient for a beginner, especially when neither author nor work is mentioned in the bibliography. In an elementary book furthermore full titles, latest edition, and place and year of publication ought to be given for all books quoted. This is now a firmly established usage, and it would be interesting to learn why Mr Armitage has departed from it. One would like furthermore to see more 'Gründlichkeit' in the classification of the material. I miss for example the now usual division between Phonology and Accidence. And more harmony should have been established between the Contents and the Text-headings of the different subdivisions. There is so little agreement in wording and otherwise that it almost looks as if the table of contents had originated independently of the text. In consequence it is rather difficult to resist the impression that the book did not receive a very careful

revision before printing such as would have been necessary to produce a smooth and harmonious outward form. This impression is supported by other little discrepancies. For example, the table of the 'Second Sound-Shift' on p. 63 does not show that W.G. *d* was treated differently in Middle and Rhine Franconian when medial or doubled, although the fact is stated on p. 62. And there is a good deal more of a like nature. The 'Definitions' (of phonetical terms) at the beginning of Chapter I are unsatisfactory in various ways: e.g. in a book which claims to be scientific, a 'sonant' should not be defined as 'any sound capable of being pronounced alone without the aid of any other sound.' Writers of elementary books like the present would be well advised to take their 'definitions' from the 'Phonetische Vorbemerkungen' in Brugmann's *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik*, and to imitate that writer in giving a reference to Sievers' *Grundzüge der Phonetik*.

R. A. Williams.

Dublin.

Bibliographie der Middelnederlandsche taal- en letterkunde. Door Louis D. Petit. Tweede deel de literatuur bevattende verschenen van 1888—1910. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1910. 8vo. pp. 221.

Wer, wie der Referent, bei seinen literarischen und bibliographischen Arbeiten die unschätzbare Hilfe erfahren hat, die L. Petits erster Teil (1888) der *Bibliographie der mnl. taal- en letterkunde* gewährte, der wird—und mit ihm jeder Freund der mnl. Literatur überhaupt—das Erscheinen der Fortsetzung auf das dankbarste begrüssen. Sie verzeichnet die einschlägigen Arbeiten, wie sie in niederländischen, französischen und deutschen Zeitschriften und in selbständigen Büchern vom Jahre 1888 bis zum Oktober 1910 erschienen sind, mit bewährtem Fleiss und Umsicht.

Die Einteilung des reichen Stoffes ist die gleiche wie im ersten Teil, d. h. er scheidet sich in zwei Abschnitte: I. *Taalkunde*, die mit ihren 66 Nummern vielleicht doch etwas mager ausgefallen ist; II. *Letterkunde*; ungleich umfangreicher (700 Nummern), gliedert sich dieser Teil in vier Unterabteilungen, deren letzte: *Textuitgaven en Critick* 127 Seiten mit 526 Nummern füllt und in sechzehn gut angeordneten Kapiteln das einschlägige Material—vollständige Texte aber auch die geringfügigsten Bruchstücke—von germanischen Sagen (III) an bis zur Volksliteratur in Prosa (XVI j) einzeichnet. In runden Klammern beigefügte Zahlen verweisen auf jene Stellen zurück, wo dieselben sprachlichen oder literarischen Fragen und Erscheinungen im ersten Teil aufgeführt wurden; öfters ist auch dort übersehenes hier nachgetragen worden.

Dem ersten Teil gegenüber ist ein neues Kapitel als *Aanhangsel* (S. 153—58) hinzugekommen: *Geschriften betreffende de beoefening en de beoefenaren der Middelnederlandsche taal- en letterkunde*, in der Hauptsache ein Verzeichnis von Lebensbeschreibungen und Nachrufen für

niederländische und einige deutsche (J. Grimm, Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Zacher) Sprach- und Literaturforscher. Zudem haben diesmal die Volksbücher (neueste Ausgaben und Zusammenstellung der älteren) ausführlichere Berücksichtigung erfahren. Zwei, wie es scheint sehr seltene Stücke, *Die Historie van Broer Ruysche*, Antwerp 1597 und *Een schone...Historie van Joncker Jan wt den vergiere* (vgl. Priebsch, *Deutsche Hss. in England*, I (1896) S. 98 n° 99 u. S. 241—85), worauf K. Meyer 1893 kurz aufmerksam machte, sind Petit entgangen. Referent hofft bald in anderem Zusammenhang auf die literarische Bedeutung derselben ausführlich zurückzukommen. Auf einzelne Ungleichmässigkeiten betreffs der Aufnahmsgrenze von Übersetzungen und Bearbeitungen, sowie von Prosawerken historischen und naturwissenschaftlichen Inhalts ist schon von anderer Seite (T. W. Müller in der *Deutschen Lit. Zeitung*, 1911, n° 20 Sp. 1229—31) hingewiesen und daselbst auch die Versetzung der 'Realien' behandelnden n° 1417—19 unter den Abschnitt *Bloemlezingen* beanstandet worden; sie hätten vielleicht eher der Abteilung II, 1 *Inleiding-Geschiedenis* angegliedert werden sollen, wo wir unter den n° 1224, 1236—37 Abhandlungen über ma. Volksglauben finden. Grosses Lob verdient das sehr ausführliche alphabetische Register (S. 165—221) vor allem wegen der Aufnahme der Initien aller kleineren *gedichten, liederen, gebeden*. Bleibt da noch ein Wunsch übrig, so wäre es der, dass unter dem Stichwort *Handschriften* der Aufbewahrungsort der im Buch angeführten in alphabetischer Folge mit Beisetzung der einschlägigen Nummern gegeben worden wäre.

Folgende Ungenauigkeiten, die mir beim Durchblättern aufgestossen sind, wären zu verbessern: N° 1703. Die Brüsseler Hs. und die (früher) in Cheltenham befindliche sind identisch; darauf hätte auch bei den N^m^ 1683, 1704—1707 aufmerksam gemacht werden sollen. N° 1773 muss es heissen:...'Naar een Hs. in Cambridge' (st. 'Ashburnham Place') und ferner gehören die Stücke 5. *Auslegung der Bergpredigt* und 6. *Über Christi Geburt* einer anderen Cambridger Hs. an.

Dass trotz aller aufgewandten Mühe und Sorgfalt dem Verfasser einzelne Publikationen entgangen sind, darüber wird sich niemand wundern; so fehlt die für die Niederlande besonders in Betracht kommende Leipziger Dissertation (1909) W. Dolchs, *Die Verbreitung oberländischer Mystikerwerke im Niederländischen*; ferner, hinter N° 1805 einzuschalten, je ein Traktat, Spruch und Predigt Meister Eckharts in mnl. Sprache, abgedruckt in des Referenten *Deutsche Hss. in England* II, S. 80—86; eine Anzahl strophischer Reim- und Mariengebete ibid. S. 307—15; eine mnl. Mystikerhandschrift beschrieben in dieser Zs. v, 2, 178 ff.; besonders aber die in der *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* Bd. 38 (1896), S. 301—33; 436—67 und Bd. 39, S. 156—79, veröffentlichte Brüsseler Liederhandschrift II, 144. Diese unter der Fülle des Gebotenen verschwindenden Verbesserungen und Zusätze vermindern natürlich den Wert des Buches nicht, das zusammen mit seinem Vorläufer einen unentbehrlichen und verlässlichen Führer darstellt, der

gern und schnell darüber Auskunft erteilt, was Gelehrten- und Liebhaberfleiss auf mnl. Sprach- und Literaturgebiet bis auf die jüngste Gegenwart geschaffen hat.

ROBERT PRIEBSCH.

LONDON.

MINOR NOTICES.

In a dissertation entitled *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene* (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, Vol. VII, Philadelphia, 1910), Miss Carrie A. Harper investigates the historical and legendary materials used in the *Faerie Queene*, Book II, Canto 10, and Book III, Canto 3, where, first in the form of a narrative and then in that of a prophecy, Spenser gives an almost complete chronicle of the British kings from Brut to Cadwallader. She points out that the question of Spenser's sources here has never been properly investigated, the commentators loosely citing illustrative passages from various chronicles without determining which Spenser actually made use of, and that such an investigation as she has undertaken will be likely to throw light upon the poet's methods of work generally. After first provisionally establishing the proposition that Spenser's main basis was Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Britonum* itself, rather than any of the later chronicles derived from it, the author proceeds to a careful and elaborate comparison of Spenser's text with this and with the later authorities, shewing that he had a very wide acquaintance with these, and selected from them freely such material as suited his purpose, especially drawing from Hardyng, Holinshed and Stow, and from the *Mirror for Magistrates*, but also occasionally from others. He shews freedom in the use of his sources, but not quite the same kind of freedom as in the case of acknowledged romances or of classical myths. That is, he treats these materials more or less with the respect that is due to history. At the same time it is to be noted that in the second portion dealing with the succession of British kings later than the time of Arthur, the poet apparently makes changes deliberately, with a view to adapting the material more fully to his purpose, and there is less evidence of a painstaking comparison of authorities. The author's theory, proposed with due caution, is that Spenser had planned and to some extent actually written a separate poem on the British chronicle history, to which the Welsh descent of Queen Elizabeth gave special interest in his eyes, and that what we have in Book II is based upon materials collected and notes made with a view to this design, while the second portion rests upon no such careful preparation. Miss Harper's dissertation follows a sound method, and seems to be written with adequate knowledge of the rather extensive literature with which it is concerned.

G. C. M.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

December, 1911—February, 1912.

GENERAL.

Baumgartner, A., Geschichte der Weltliteratur. Ergänzungsband. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Freiburg, Herder. 12 M.

Bovet, E., Lyrisme, Épopée, Drame. Un loi de l'histoire littéraire expliquée par l'évolution générale. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Creizenach, W., Geschichte des neueren Dramas. I. Bd. 2nd ed. Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

Goldstein, M., Darius, Xerxes und Artaxerxes im Drama der neueren Literaturen. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Philologie, LIV.) Leipzig, A. Deichert. 3 M.

Havers, W., Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. (Untersuchungen zur indogerm. Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, III.) Strassburg, Trübner. 11 M.

Junk, V., Gralsage und Graldichtung des Mittelalters. (Sitzungsberichte der kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. CLXVIII, 4.) Vienna, Hölder. 5 Kr.

Schmeïng, K., Flucht- und Werbungssagen in der Legende. (Forschungen und Funde, I.) Münster, Aschendorff. 1 M. 25.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Matzke, J. E., Memorial Volume. (Leland Stanford Junior University Publications.) Stanford University Press.

Meyer-Lübke, W., Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 3. Lieferung. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Studi romanzi editi a cura di E. Monaci. Fasc. VII. Rome, E. Loescher. 18 L.

Latin.

Alfonsi, Petrus, Disciplina clericalis (das älteste Novellenbuch des Mittelalters), nach allen bekannten Handschriften herausg. von A. Hilka und W. Söderhjelm. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, 1.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 20.

Honorati, Vita sancti. Nach drei Handschriften herausg. von B. Munk (Zeitschrift für roman. Phil., XXXII. Beiheft.) Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M

Klapper, J., Exempla aus Handschriften des Mittelalters. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, 2.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Lehmann, P., Johannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften. (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Phil. des Mittelalters, IV, 1.) Munich, C. A. Beck. 10 M.

Italian.

Amaducci, P., La fonte della Divina Commedia, scoperta e descritta. 2 vols. Bologna, Beltrami. 10 L.

Bandello, M., Le novelle, a cura di G. Brognoligo. Vol. v. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXIII.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Barberino, F., I documenti d' amore secondo i manoscritti originali a cura di F. Egidi. Fasc. IX. (Società filologica romana.) Rome, E. Loescher. 4 L.

Bouchaud, P. de, Les poésies de Michel-Ange Buonarroti et de Vittoria Colonna. Essai sur la lyrique italienne du XVI^e^ siècle. Paris, Grasset. 3 fr. 50.

Busnelli, G., Il concetto e l' ordine del Paradiso dantesco : indagini e studi preceduti da una lettera di F. Flamini. Parte II. L' ordine. (Collezione di opuscoli danteschi inediti o rari, CX—CXIII.) Città di Castello, Lapi. 3 L. 20.

Castle, M. L. E., Italian Literature. London, Herbert and Daniel. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Cocai, M. (Teofilo Folengo), Le maccheronee, a cura di A. Luzio. Vol. II. (Scrittori d' Italia, XIX.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Commedie del Cinquecento, a cura di I. Sanesi. Vol. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXV.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Gioberti, V., Del rinnovamento civile, a cura di F. Nicolini. Vol. III. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXIV.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Giusti, G., Poesie scelte con commento di P. Carli. (Biblioteca scolastica di classici italiani.) Florence, Sansoni. 3 L.

Gozzi, C., La Marfisa bizzarra, a cura di C. Ortiz. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXII.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Mancini, G., Vita di L. B. Alberti. 2da ediz. Florence, Carnesecchi. 15 L.

Marino, G. B., Epistolario, seguito da lettere di altri scrittori del seicento a cura di A. Borzelli e F. Nicolini. Vol. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, XX.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Novella, La, di Gualtieri e Griselda. Faksimile eines um 1500 in Florenz hergestellten Druckes im Besitze der kgl. Universitätsbibliothek in Erlangen. Erlangen, Mencke. 2 M.

Piccioni, L., G. Baretti prima della 'Frustra letteraria' (1719–1760). L' uomo, il poeta, il critico. (Giorn. storico della letteratura italiana. Supplemento, XIII, XIV.) Turin, E. Loescher. 13 L.

Tommasini, O., La vita e gli scritti di N. Machiavelli nella loro relazione col machiavellismo : storia ed esame critico. Vol. II. Rome, Loescher. 30 L.

Wędkiewicz, S., Materialien zu einer Syntax der italienischen Bedingungssätze. (Zeitschrift für roman. Philologie, XXXI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M. 50.

Spanish.

Calisto e Melibea, Comedia de. (Bibliotheca Romanica, 142—145.) Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. 1 M. 60.

Cervantes, M. de, Don Quijote de la Mancha. Edición y notas de F. Rodriguez Marin. II. Madrid, 'La Lectura.' (Paris, Champion.)

Cotarelo y Mori, E., Collección de entremeses, loas, bailes, jácaras y mojigangas desde fines del siglo XVI á mediados del XVIII. (Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Espagnoles, XVII, XVIII.) Madrid, Bailly-Baillière. 24 P.

Eklogen, Sieben spanische dramatische, mit einer Einleitung über die Anfänge des spanischen Dramas. Herausg. von E. Kohler. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, IX, 3.) Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

Morley, S., Spanish Ballads (Romances escogidos), edited with Introduction and Notes. New York, Holt & Co.

Rodriguez Marin, F., Don Francisco de Rojas Zorilla. Noticias biográficas y bibliográficas. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos.

French.

(*a*) *Old French.*

Altfranzösische Dichtungen, Zwei: La chastelaine de Saint Gille. Du Chevalier au Barisel. Neu herausgegeben von O. Schultz-Gora. 2nd ed. Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

Heyl, K., Die Theorie der Minne in den ältesten Minneromanen Frankreichs. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, IV.) Marburg, A. Ebel. 5 M. 50.

Kristian von Troyes, Wilhelm von England. Ein Abenteuerroman. Herausg. von W. Foerster. (Romanische Bibliothek, XX.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 40.

Lancelot del Lac, Der altfranzösische Prosaroman von. 2. Branche. Les enfances Lancelot (I. Teil). Herausg. von H. Becker. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, VI.) Marburg, Ebel. 5 M.

Livre, Li quatre, des reis. Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige in einer französischen Bearbeitung des 12. Jahrh. Herausg. von E. R. Curtius. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, IX, 2.) Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

Paris, G., La vie de Saint Alexis, poème du XI^e^ siècle. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 1 fr. 50.

Remppis, M., Die Vorstellungen von Deutschland im französischen Heldenepos und Roman und ihre Quellen. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXIV. Beiheft.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

(*b*) *Modern French.*

Baldensperger, F., Alfred de Vigny, contribution à sa biographie intellectuelle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Cazals, F. A. et G. Le Rouge, Les derniers jours de P. Verlaine. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Chateaubriand, F. R. de, Correspondance générale, publ. avec introduction, etc. par L. Thomas. Tome I. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Collas, G., Les sentiments de l'Académie française sur la tragi-comédie du Cid, d'après le manuscrit de Chapelain. Paris, A. Picard. 2 fr. 50.

Croze, A de, La chanson populaire de l'île de Corse. Paris, H. Champion. 5 fr.

Eude, R., Alfred de Vigny intime. Paris. 10 fr.

Giraud, V., Nouvelles études sur Chateaubriand. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Karénine, W., George Sand, sa vie et ses œuvres. Tome III. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 7 fr. 50.

LEHMANN, R., Die Formelemente des Stils von Flaubert in den Romanen und Novellen. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, v.) Marburg, Ebel. 3 M.

LONGNON, H., P. de Ronsard, essai de biographie. Les ancêtres, la jeunesse. Paris, H. Champion. 8 fr.

MAGNE, É., Voiture et les années de gloire de l'Hôtel de Rambouillet, 1636–48. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

MÉLIA, J., Stendhal et ses commentateurs. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

NERVAL, GÉRARD DE, Correspondance (1830–55). Introduction et notes par J. Marsan. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

PAULI, F., Die philosophischen Grundanschauungen in den Romanen des Abbé Prévost im Besonderen in der Manon Lescaut. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, VII.) Marburg, Ebel. 3 M.

PELISSIER, G., Le réalisme du romantisme. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

PRICE, W. R., The Symbolism of Voltaire's novels. (Columbia University Studies in Romance Philology and Literature.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROCHAMBEAU, COMTE DE, Bibliographie des œuvres de Jean La Fontaine. Paris, A. Rouquette. 25 fr.

ROLLAND, J., La tragédie française au XVI^e^ siècle. Les Juifves. Paris, Sansot. 4 fr.

SAINTE-BEUVE, C., Lettres inédites à Ch. Labitte. Introd. et notes par G. Sangnier. Paris, Champion. 2 fr. 50.

SÉCHÉ, L., Études d'histoire romantique. Les amitiés de Lamartine. I. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

STRACHEY, G. L., Landmarks in French Literature. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s.* net.

TEDESCHI, A., Ossian, 'l'Homère du Nord,' en France. Paris, H. Champion. 4 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

ANDERSEN, V., Dansk Litteratur. Forskning og Undervisning. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 Kr. 75.

ATTERBOM, P. D. A., Atterboms bref till sin fästmö 1823–26. Utg. av H. Atterbom-Svenson. Stockholm, Bonnier. 5 Kr. 50.

BERGE, R., Norske folkevisur av samlingane etter Sophus Bugge med visur samla og utgjevne. Christiania, Dybwad. 2 Kr. 50.

BERTEVAL, W., Le théâtre d'Ibsen. Paris, 3 fr. 50.

BJÖRNSON, B., Aarhundredernes legende. Gjenfortalt efter V. Hugo. Med et efterord av Chr. Collin. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 Kr. 25.

FEILBERG, H. F., Festskrift til, fra nordiske Sprog- og Folkemindeforskere. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 8 Kr.

FRÖDING, G., Samlade Skrifter. Minnesupplaga. II, III, VI. Stockholm, Bonnier. Each 1 Kr.

HOLBERG, L., Three Comedies translated. London, Longmans, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

LAMM, M., J. G. Oxenstierna. En gustaviansk natursvärmares lif och dikt. Stockholm, Geber. 6 Kr. 50.

LEVERTIN, O., Samlade skrifter. XVII, XVIII. Stockholm, Bonnier. 2 Kr. and 2 Kr. 50.

MJÖBERG, J., Stilstudier i Tegnérs ungdomsdiktning. (Göteborgs högskolas Aarsskrift, I.) Göteborg, Wettergren och Kerber. 4 Kr. 25.

NOREEN, A., Spridda studier. Saml. 2. Populära uppsater. Stockholm, Ljus. 3 Kr.

RÖNNING, F., P. M. Möller. En Levnedskildring med et Udvalg af hans Arbejder. 2. Udg. Copenhagen, Gad. 1 Kr. 75.

RYDBERG, V., Skrifter. I, III. Stockholm, Bonnier. 3 Kr. and 2 Kr. 75.

SCHÜCK H. och K. WARBURG, Illustrerad svensk litteraturhistoria. 2. omarb. och utvidgade uppl. I. Stockholm, Geber. 14 Kr.

Sveriges Nationallitteratur, 1500–1900. VIII (Esaias Tegnér, E. G. Geijer, utg. af O. Sylwan), XIV (1800-talets dramatik, utg. af F. Vetterlund). Stockholm, Bonnier. Each 2 Kr.

Dutch.

DYSERINCK, J., A. L. G. Bosboom-Toussaint. Levens- en Karakterschets. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 2 fl. 50.

KALFF, G., Letterkunde en tooneel te Amsterdam in de 17de eeuw. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 5 fl.

LOON, H. VAN, Nederlandsche vertalingen naar Molière uit de 17e eeuw. The Hague, L. A. Dickhoff. 1 fl. 75.

MEERKERK, J. B., C. B. Huet. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink en Zoon. 2 fl. 50.

English.

(*a*) *Old and Middle English.*

EWALD, W., Der Humor in Chaucers Canterbury Tales. (Studien zur engl. Philologie, XLV.) Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

MÜLLER, A., Mittelenglische geistliche und weltliche Lyrik des 13. Jahrh. nach Motiven und Formen. (Studien zur engl. Philologie, XLIV.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

(*b*) *Modern English.*

AKERLUND, A., On the History of the Definite Tenses in English. Lund (Cambridge, W. Heffer). 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

ARNOLD, M. L., The Soliloquies of Shakespeare: a Study in Technic. (Columbia University Studies in English.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

BERGSTEN, N., A Study on Compound Substantives in English (Diss.). Uppsala, Almqvist och Wiksell. 2 Kr.

BROOKE, C. F. TUCKER, The Tudor Drama. A History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare. London, Constable. 6*s.* net.

BROWNING, R., A Selection of Poems, 1855–64. Ed. W. T. Young. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

CHATTERTON, T., The Rowley Poems. Reprinted from Tyrwhitt's third edition. Ed. by M. E. Hare. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

CLEVELAND, J., The Poems of, Edited by J. M. Berdan. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press. (Oxford, Univ. Press.) 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Cooper's Grammatica linguae anglicanae (1685). Herausg. von J. D. Jones. (Neudrucke frühnenenglischer Grammatiken, v.) Halle, Niemeyer. 10 M.

Courthope, W. J., The Connection between Ancient and Modern Romance. (British Academy.) London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

Crockett, W. S., The Scott originals: an account of notables and worthies, the originals of characters in the Waverley Novels. Edinburgh, Foulis. 6*s.* net.

Delattre, F., English Fairy Poetry from the Origins to the Seventeenth Century. London, H. Frowde. (Paris, H. Didier.) 4*s.* net.

Delattre, F., R. Herrick. Contribution à l'étude de la poésie lyrique en Angleterre au XVII^e^ siècle. Paris, F. Alcan. 12 fr.

Deloney, T., Works. Edited from the earliest extant editions and broadsides by F. O. Mann. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 18*s.* net.

Dickens, Ch., as editor; being letters written by him to W. H. Wills, his sub-editor. Selected and edited by R. C. Lehmann. London, Smith Elder. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Duff, E. G., The English Provincial Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders to 1557. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 4*s.* net.

Dumbacher, C., Bulwers Roman 'Harold.' Eine Quellenuntersuchung. (Würzburger Beiträge zur engl. Literaturgeschichte, I.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 60.

Eimer, M., Byron und der Kosmos. Ein Beitrag zur Weltanschauung des Dichters und den Ansichten seiner Zeit. (Anglistische Forschungen, XXXIV.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M. 20.

Gray, Ch. H., Lodowick Carliell. His Life, a Discussion of his Plays and 'The Deserving Favourite.' Chicago, Univ. Press (Cambridge, Univ. Press). 6*s.* net.

Hedgcock, F. A., A Cosmopolitan actor: David Garrick and his French friends. London, S. Paul. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hunt, M. L., Thomas Dekker, a Study. New York, Columbia Univ. Press (Oxford, Univ. Press). 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hurd, R., Letters on Chivalry and Romance with the third Elizabethan Dialogue. Ed. by E. J. Morley. London, Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

James I of England. New Poems from a hitherto unpublished MS. in the British Museum. Ed. by A. F. Westcott. New York, Columbia Univ. Press (Oxford, Univ. Press). 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jenkins, H., The Life of George Borrow. London, Murray. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Johnson, W. S., Thomas Carlyle, 1814–31. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press (London, H. Frowde). 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lounsbury, T. R., The Early Literary Career of R. Browning. London, Fisher Unwin. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lyrical Forms in English, edited by N. Hepple. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* net.

Nessler, K., Geschichte der Ballade Chevy Chase. (Palaestra, CXII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M.

Onions, C. T., A Shakespeare Glossary. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Price, W., Days with the English poets: Tennyson, Browning, Byron. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Richter, H., Geschichte der englischen Romantik. I, 2. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 12 M.

Sidney, Sir Ph., The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia. Edited by A. Feuillerat. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Southern, Th., The Loyal Brother. Edited with Introduction and Notes by P. Hamelius. (Bibl. de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège, xx.) Liège, Vaillant-Carmanne (Paris, H. Champion). 5 fr.

Streissle, A., Personifikation und poetische Beseelung bei Scott und Burns. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Tennyson, Hallam, Lord, Tennyson and his Friends. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* net.

Wendt, G., Syntax des heutigen Englisch. i. Teil. Die Wortlehre. Heidelberg, Winter. 5 M. 40.

Wetz, W., Die Lebensnachrichten über Shakespeare mit dem Versuch einer Jugend- und Bildungsgeschichte des Dichters. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 4 M. 25.

Wilson, J. D., Life in Shakespeare's England. A Book of Elizabethan Prose. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wordsworth, W. and S. T. Coleridge, Lyrical Ballads, 1798. Ed. by H. Littledale. London, H. Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Writing Scholar's Companion, The (1695). Ed. by E. Ekwall. (Neudrucke frühneuenglischer Grammatiken, vi.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

German.

(*a*) *General (incl. language).*

Boehme, G., Neudeutsche Grammatik oder Reformdeutsch. Ein Versuch, die deutsche Sprache zu vereinfachen und zugleich weiter auszubauen. Tübingen, A. und S. Weil. 4 M. 50.

Könnecke, G., Bilderatlas zur Geschichte der deutschen Nationallíteratur. 2. Aufl. Marburg, Elwert. 22 M.

Nadler, J., Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften. i. Die Altstämme (800–1600). Regensburg, Habbel. 8 M.

Wilmanns, W., Deutsche Grammatik. i. Abt. Lautlehre. 3. Aufl. Strassburg, Trübner. 9 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Brockstedt, G., Von mittelhochdeutschen Volksepen französischen Ursprungs. ii. Kiel, R. Cordes. 8 M.

Herold, K., Der Münchener Tristan. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte und Kritik des Tristan Gottfrieds von Strassburg. (Quellen und Forschungen, cxiv.) Strassburg, Trübner. 3 M.

Hübner, A., Daniel, ein Deutschordensdichtung. (Palaestra, ci.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M.

Matthias, W., Die geographische Nomenclatur Italiens im altdeutschen Schrifttum. Leipzig, Brandstetter. 4 M.

Ostendorf, F., Überlieferung und Quelle der Reinoldlegende. (Forschungen und Funde, iii.) Münster, Aschendorff. 2 M.

Pfannmüller, L., Die vier Redaktionen der Heidin. (Palaestra, cviii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 14 M.

Schroeder, C., Der deutsche Facetus. (Palaestra, lxxxvi.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 8 M. 60.

Schulte, K., Das Verhältnis von Notkers Nuptiae philologiae et Mercurii zum Kommentar des Remigius Antissiodorensis. (Forschungen und Funde, III, 2.) Münster, Aschendorff. 3 M.

Way, A. S., The Lay of the Nibelung Men. Translated from the Old German Text. Cambridge, University Press. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Aubert, A., Runge og Romantikken. Et Livsfragment fra den tyske Romantiks Blomstring. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 10 Kr.

Becker, C., A. G. Kästners Epigramme. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren Literatur, IV.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

Berger, K., Theodor Körner. Bielefeld, Velhagen und Klasing. 5 M.

Bode, W., Der fröhliche Goethe. Berlin, E. S. Mittler. 3 M.

Borchardt, H. H., A. Tscherning. Ein Beitrag zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte des 17. Jahrh. Munich, Hans Sachs-Verlag. 10 M.

Bräuning-Oktavio, H., Beiträge zur Geschichte und Frage nach den Mitarbeitern der 'Frankfurter gelehrten Anzeigen' vom Jahre 1772. Darmstadt, Vogelsberger. 3 M. 50.

Brentano, C., Sämtliche Werke. XIII, XIV. Munich, G. Müller. Each 6 M.

Crawford, M. C., Goethe and his Women friends. London, T. Fisher Unwin. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Eckermann, J. P., Beiträge zur Poesie mit besonderer Hinweisung auf Goethe. (Goethe-Bibliothek.) Berlin, Morawe und Scheffelt. 3 M.

Falk, J., Goethe, aus näherem persönlichen Umgange dargestellt. (Goethe-Bibliothek.) Berlin, Morawe und Scheffelt. 3 M.

Frank, R., Wie der Faust entstand. Urkunde, Sage und Dichtung. Berlin, Verlag Neues Leben. 3 M.

Geitel, M., Entlegene Spuren Goethes. Goethes Beziehungen zu der Mathematik, Physik, Chemie. Munich, Oldenbourg. 6 M.

Goethe, Der junge. Neue Ausgabe von M. Morris. VI. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 4 M. 50.

Gotthelf, J. (A. Bitzius), Sämtliche Werke, herausg. von R. Hunziker. VII. Munich, E. Rentsch. 5 M.

Hagenbring, P., Goethes Götz von Berlichingen. Erläuterung und literarhistorische Würdigung. I. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, IX.) Halle, Niemeyer, 2 M. 80.

Halm, H., Volkstümliche Dichtung im 17. Jahrh. I. M. Abele. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, XL.) Weimar, Duncker. 5 M.

Hartmann, J., Das Verhältnis von Hans Sachs zur sogenannten Steinhöwelschen Decameronübersetzung. (Acta Germanica, II.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 20.

Heinse, J. J. W., Briefe aus der Düsseldörfer Gemäldegallerie, 1776–77. Mit einer Skizze der deutschen Geniezeit. (Textausgaben und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Ästhetik, I.) Vienna, E. Schmid. 6 Kr.

Hoffmann, C., Deutsche Lyrik aus Österreich seit Grillparzer. Berlin, Meyer und Jessen. 4 M.

Klettenberg, S. K. von, Bekenntnisse, Schriften und Briefe, herausg. von H. Funck. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 5 M.

Kolitz, K., J. C. Hallmanns Dramen. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 60.

Kühn, P., Die Frauen um Goethe. Weimarer Interieurs, II. Leipzig, Klinkhardt und Biermann. 5 M.

Kühn, W., H. von Kleist und das deutsche Theater. Munich, Hans Sachs-Verlag. 2 M. 50.

Lichtenberger, H., Novalis. (Les grands écrivains étrangers.) Paris, Bloud et Cie. 2 fr. 50.

Liliencron, D. von, Neue Kunde von. Des Dichters Briefe an seinen ersten Verleger herausg. von H. Spiero. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 3 M.

Ludwig, A., Schiller. Sein Leben und Schaffen. Dem deutschen Volke erzählt. Berlin, Ullstein. 6 M.

Schaidenreisser, S., Odyssea, Augsburg, 1537. Neudruck, herausg. von F. Weidling. (Teutonia, XIII.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 5 M.

Schiller, J. F. von and J. W. von Goethe, Briefwechsel. Im Auftrage des Goethe- und Schiller-Archivs nach den Handschriften herausg. von H. G. Gräf und A. Leitzmann. 3. Bde. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 7 M.

Schlegel, F., Briefe an Frau Christine von Stransky, geborene Freiin von Schleich. Herausg. von M. Rottmanner, II. (Schriften des literarischen Vereins in Wien.) Vienna, C. Fromme.

Schwartz, H., F. H. Jacobis 'Allwill.' (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, VIII.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M.

Spiess, O., Die dramatische Handlung in Lessings 'Emilia Galotti' und 'Minna von Barnhelm.' (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, VI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Storck, W. F., Goethes Faust und die bildende Kunst. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 5 M.

Sucher, P., Les sources du merveilleux chez E. T. A. Hoffmann. (Bibl. de philologie et littérature modernes.) Paris, F. Alcan. 5 fr.

Tristan und Isalde. Herausg. nach dem ältesten Druck, der 1484 bei A. Sorg in Augsburg erschien, von R. Benz. (Die deutschen Volksbücher.) Jena, Diederichs. 3 M.

Wagner, A. M. Goethe, Kleist, Hebbel und das religiöse Problem ihrer dramatischen Dichtung. Leipzig, L. Voss. 2 M. 80.

Waldhausen, A., Die Technik der Rahmenerzählung bei Gottfried Keller. (Bonner Forschungen, II.) Berlin, Grote. 3 M.

Wandrey, C., Stefan George. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. 2 M.

Wieland, C. M., Gesammelte Schriften. I. Abt. 7. Bd. Berlin, Weidmann. 9 M.

VOLUME VII JULY, 1912 NUMBER 3

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF 'JACKE JUGELER.'

IN vol. I, p. 202, of Arber's *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, 1554–1640 A.D. (corresponding to fol. 85 b of Register A), occurs the following entry:

> Recevyd of William Coplande for his lycense for pryntinge of an interlude intituled Jack Juggeler and mistress Boundgrace .....iiij^{d}.

The part of the Register in which this occurs extends from fol. 84 a—92 a, and is headed 'ffor Takynge of ffynes for Copyes as folowethe.' This again is part of the 'accompte made by.....Wardens of the Companye of Stacioners of all such sommes of monye as hathe comme to theare handes from the xxijth Daye of July Anno 1562 unto the xxij of July Anno 1563 which is by the space of one hole yere as folowethe.'

The 'accompte' for the 12 months fills fol. 82 a—fol. 96 b.

The entry of the payment for *Jack Juggeler* is 36th out of 124. Five entries back is one 'Recevyd of garrard Dewes for his lycense for pryntinge of a pycture of [a] monsterus pygge at Hamsted...iiij^{d}.'

Arber's note on this is, 'the broadside is entitled *The description of a monstrous pig, the which was farrowed at Hamsted besyde London, the xvi day of October, the present yeare of our Lord God,* MDLxij.'

This, and its comparatively early occurrence (the lists were not alphabetical), suggest that the entry about *Jack Juggeler* belongs to the year 1562. No. 53 was a payment in respect of *Crestenmas Carroles*. This again points to 1562. It may be added that William Copland issued books with his imprint from 1548 to 1561 (*D. N. B.*).

We may therefore conclude that an edition of *Jack Juggeler* was probably published in the year 1562. The two loose leaves in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire may have belonged to this edition, as the spelling is much later than that of the complete copy, which we shall see reason to believe was written between 1547 and 1552.

It is evident that the play cannot have been written before 1547 from the use of the word 'bedlem,' which occurs twice, viz. in l. 498:

This bedlem knaue without dought is mad

and in l. 975:

Nor a more frantike mad knaue in bedelem.

We know that the building of the dissolved priory of St Mary of Bethlehem was given to the City of London as an hospital for lunatics in the year 1547, before which the word 'Bedlam' could have had no association with madness.

The lower limit is a more difficult question, and depends on the relation of *Jacke Jugeler* (as it will now be spelt when referring to the older edition), and *Ralph Roister Doister.*

We may assume that *Ralph Roister Doister* was written in 1552. It is not necessary to discuss the question here, but the reasons for this assumption may be found in the introduction to the edition of the play in the Temple Dramatists (ed. Williams-Robin), pp. v—vii.

What reasons are there for believing that *Jacke Jugeler* was written before *Ralph Roister Doister*?

Whether written by the same person or not, there is evidently a close connexion between the two plays in method, characters, and language.

(*a*) *Method.* Both adapt episodes from Latin comedy to the environment of Tudor London, and embody more or less literal transcripts from Plautus. The prologue of *Ralph Roister Doister* is either a condensed paraphrase of the prologue of *Jacke Jugeler*, or the latter is an expansion of the main points of the former.

(*b*) *Characters.* Mayster Boungrace corresponds to Gawyn Goodlucke, Dame Coye to Christian Custance, Jacke Jugeler to Mathewe Merygreeke, Jenkyn Careawaye to Truepenie, Ales trype and go to Tibet Talk apace.

(*c*) *Language.* Among the more obvious resemblances of language may be noted:

Jacke Jugeler.	Ralph Roister Doister.
69 you shal here a thing y^{t} onlie shal make you merie & glad.	I, i, 59 I can when I will make him mery and glad.
137 my cosune Careawaie.	III, i, 4 my cousin Roister Doister.
148 by cokes precious potstike.	III, iv, 127 by cocks precious potsticke.
228 she swimmeth to and fro.	II, iii, 46 ye shall see hir glide and swimme.
317 saint Gorge y^{e} boroue.	IV, viii, 45 sainct George to borow.
318 ieopard a ioynt.	IV, viii, 17 ieoparde my hande.
348 who lustith to feale shall find his hart creping out at his heele.	III, iii, 96 I might feele your soule departing within an inche of your heele.

430 *In nomine patris.*	I, iv, 49 *Nomine patris.*
486 Truce for a whyle.	IV, viii, 33 truce for a pissing while or twaine.
496 beate on mee, tyll I stinke.	IV, iii, 120 I shall cloute thee tyll thou stinke.
593 by gods precious.	IV, viii, 40 by cocks precious.
615 well curryed.	I, iii, 77 a curried cote.
640 let me alone.	I, ii, 175 lette me alone.
726 this wagepastie.	III, ii, 10 a little wagpastie.
731 the matter lyeth gretylie me a pon.	I, iv, 9 this lieth vpon his preferment.
861 I shall rape thee.	III, v, 93 rappe you againe.
976 hence to Jherusalem.	IV, vii, 60 hennes to grece.
1013 cal ye other his good maister.	IV, vii, 100 be good maister to her.

If these resemblances are allowed to establish a *prima facie* probability of connexion between the two plays, whether written by the same person or not, which of the two is more likely to have been written before the other?

Jacke Jugeler is a one-act farce on the lines of Heywood's interludes, with three scenes (vv. 84—601, 602—773, 774—992), and five characters, needing only three or four performers (if the prologue and the epilogue were recited by one), the parts being distributed thus:—(1) Careaway, (2) Jugeler and Dame Coye, (3) Ales and Mayster Boungrace; or, (1) Careaway, (2) Jugeler and Ales, (3) Dame Coye, (4) Mayster Boungrace. The time of the action is only an hour, and the place is unchanged.

Ralph Roister Doister is a regularly constructed comedy of five acts, subdivided into numerous scenes, with thirteen characters, requiring as many as ten actors, even if some of the minor parts are combined. The time required for the action is two days. The place, as in *Jacke Jugeler*, need not be changed, the scene being laid before Custance's house, but the characters are more elaborated and individualised than their somewhat sketchy and conventional counterparts.

Which of these then is likely to have preceded the other in order of time, the outline or the finished work? If they were both written by the same person, probability almost becomes certainty. In that case *Ralph Roister Doister* can no more have preceded *Jacke Jugeler* than the full corn in the ear can precede the blade, or the fruit the blossom. Was then *Jacke Jugeler* written by the author of *Ralph Roister Doister*?

The verbal resemblances between *Jacke Jugeler* and *Ralph Roister Doister* would not by themselves prove that the two pieces were composed by the same hand. The author of the one play may have copied from the other. But if we find striking similarities of language between *Jacke Jugeler* and the non-dramatic works of the author of *Ralph*

Roister Doister, the identity of authorship becomes much more probable. Such are:

Jacke Jugeler.	Udall's Prose Works.
42 And Cicero Tullius.....in that his fyrst boke which he wrot, and entytulid, of an honest mans office.	*Apophthegmes*, f. 279, '*Marcus Tullius* in y^e^ thirde booke of that his werke entitleed, *de officiis*, (that is to saie, of honeste behauour, or, how eche manne ought to vse and to demeane hymselfe.'
85 Rest you merye.	*Floures*, '*Amice salue.* Good felow god you saue, or, o louynge frend god rest you mery.'
108 god before.	*Apophthegmes*, f. 152, 'For the grekes saien *σὺν θεοῖς*, with the Goddes, for that we saye in englyshe, Goddes pleasure beeyng so, or, by the wyll and grace of God, or, and God before, or, God saying amen.
145 oon faire toche.	*Apophthegmes*, f. 105, 'yea and for a faire touche.'
249 I may giue my life for halpenis three.	*Floures*, '*ego perierim*, I am vtterlye vndone, or I may gyue my lyfe for an halfepeny.'
293 arayed.	*Erasm. Par.*, *Luke* xiii, 11, 'Araied with a disease.'
615 curryed.	*Floures*, '*Verberibus caesum te*, &c. I woll all to currie the, &c.'
657 as sholde be to him a corrasiue.	*Apophthegmes*, f. 154, 'geuen no bodye a corrosif.'
674 breched in suche a brake.	*Erasm. Par. Luke*, Pref. 6 b, 'So should I in this matier stand in a streight brake.'
731 the matter lyeth gretylie me a pon.	*Floures*, '*Scin ad te attinere hanc omnem rem?* Doest thou remembre that all this matter perteyneth to the? or lyeth the vppon?'
908 fauoure your fyste.	*Floures*, '*tibi parce*, fauour or spare your selfe.'

If, in addition to these resemblances of language, we find in *Jacke Jugeler* allusions obviously autobiographical, which may be explained by known facts in the life of Udall, the probability of his authorship is still further increased.

These facts are too well known to need repetition. It is enough to say that, in connexion with a robbery of silver plate alleged to have been committed at Eton during his headmastership, Udall was examined by the Privy Council in March 1541–2, and confessed that he had committed a 'heinous offence,' for which he was imprisoned in the Marshalsea. (Nicolas, *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, vol. VII, pp. 152–3.) In consequence of this Udall was summarily dismissed from his mastership. Yet, in spite of his confession, there are good reasons for believing that he was innocent of the graver charges brought against

him. Had they been true he would have been ruined for life. Instead of which we find him still vicar of Braintree in 1544, bearer of the Lord Privy Seal's letter to the Bishop of Carlisle, then resident at Eton, and soon in high favour at court, and associated in literary work with the Princess Mary.

A letter is extant from Udall to a patron who has been unsuccessfully endeavouring to procure his restoration to the mastership of Eton. (*Letters of Eminent Literary Men*, Camden Society, pp. 1—7.) From this we gather that his influential friend has 'susteined gret travaill, peines, and trouble in that behalf,' and that Udall wished to recover the position 'oonly of an honest purpose to discharge my debtes, and by little and little as I might to paye every man his own.' He craves to be bestowed 'to suche condition where I maye by sobre livyng bee recovered to sum state of an honest man.' He admits that he has deserved his patron's displeasure and indignation, but trusts that his offences '*humana quidem esse et emendari posse.*' If received to grace and favour he hopes that 'this your correpcion shall bee a sufficient scourge to make me, during my lif, more wise and more ware utterly for ever to eschewe and avoid all kindes of all maner excesses and abuses that have been reported to reigne in me.' He admits that, the more tenderly his benefactor had favoured and loved him, the more grievously he must take his 'lewdnes and foly,' but he hopes for the mercy and forgiveness due 'to all suche as with wholl herte and purpose of emendemente without dissymulation returne to the holsome pathe of honestee, from whiche by youth or frailtee, thei have chaunced for a tyme to swerve.' He speaks of his patron's clemency making 'of an unthrifte an honest man,' and gives examples of young men who, after being 'of a veray riottous and dissolute sorte of livynge' in youth, have become monuments 'of all frugalitee, religion, sobrietee, and holynes.' Lastly, in a sentence which seems to sum up the situation, he begs his patron to 'accepte this myn honest chaunge from vice to vertue, from prodigalitee to frugall livyng, from negligence of teachyng to assiduitee, from playe to studie, from lightness to gravitee.'

In this letter, while there is the fullest and even the most abject acknowledgment of extravagance, laxity, and neglect of duty, there is no admission of the graver offences with which he was charged.

We are confronted then with two apparently conflicting conclusions, (1) that Udall confessed his guilt before the Privy Council, (2) that he was probably innocent. How are these to be reconciled?

If *Jacke Jugeler* was written by Udall, the explanation is given in

the epilogue. In the first stanza of the epilogue we are pointedly invited to look for some ulterior significance in the play. Though the cat in the proverb had lost her eye, there was some meaning in her wink; in other words, though one cannot speak out, one may hint and suggest. No tale can be told 'but that sum Englyshe maye be piked therof out,' i.e., some modern application may be discovered.

> As this trifling interlud.....may signifie sum further meaning if it be well serched.

Could anything be plainer?

It is the fashion nowadays—

> That the symple innosaintes ar deluded
> And an hundred thousand diuers wayes
> By suttle and craftye meanes shamefullie abused
> And by strength force and violence oft tymes compelled
> To beliue and saye the moune is made of a grene chese
> Or ells haue great harme, and parcace their life lese.

It is an old saying that might, force, strength, power, and colourable subtlety oppress, debar, overrun and defeat right. The poor simple innocent that has had wrong and injury must call the other his 'good maister' for showing him such mercy. (Cf. such phrases in Udall's letter as 'right worshipfull and my singlar *good maister*'; 'sens the tyme that your maistership, at the intercession of my good frendes, promised upon myn honest demeanure fromthensforthe to be my *good maister*'; 'bee *good maister* to me this oons'; 'I trust ye wold become *better maister* unto me.')

> And as it is daylie syne for fere of ferther disprofite
> He must that man his best frende and maister call
> Of whome he neuer receiued any maner benefite
> And at whose hand he neuer han any good at all
> And must graunt, affirme, or denie, whatsoeuer he shall
> He must saye the Croue is whight, yf he be so commaunded
> Ye and that he himselfe is into another body chaunged.

The next stanza is still more significant, if it was written by Udall:

> He must saye he dyd amysse, though he neuer dyd offend
> He must aske forgeuenes, where he did no trespace
> Or ells be in troble, care and meserye without ende
> And be cast in sum arrierage, without any grace
> And that thing he sawe done before his owne face
> He must by compulsion, stifelie denye
> And for feare whether he woll or not saye tonge you lye.

The reference to being 'cast in some arrearage' would be explained by passages of the letter in which Udall speaks of his 'honest purpose to *discharge my debtes*,' and says that if his patron should reject and cast him off, 'though I wer *in noo manns daunger*, yet noo man of honor or

honestee woll either receive me, or dooe for me, or favour me, or looke on me.' Again, at the end of the letter he says, 'where percase *aeris alieni magnitudo animum tuum deterret*, I doubte not, havyng your maistershippes favour and good helpe, to bee hable to shake it of within two or three yeres at the uttirmust by suche meanes as I shall declare unto your maistership if it maye please the same to heare me.'

The epilogue continues in the same marked strain:

> He that is stronger and more of power and might
> Yf he be disposed to reuenge his cause
> Woll sone pike a quarell be it wronge or right
> To the inferior and weker for a cople of straues
> And woll agaynst him so extremelie lay the lawes
> That he wol put him to the worse, other by false iniurie
> Or by some craft and subtelete, or ells by plaine teranie.

From all this we gather that some simple innocent person has been beguiled by subtlety and forced by violence to accept and affirm obvious impossibilities. Some influential personage has picked a quarrel with him, and ruined him by the dishonest or arbitrary exercise of the laws. He has been compelled to call his oppressor benefactor for sparing him, and to 'hold up his yea and nay' even to denying his own identity. Under penalty of endless trouble and misery, of being arrested for debt, and being imprisoned without hope of release, he has had to confess and to ask forgiveness for an offence of which he was guiltless, to deny what he saw done before his eyes, and to give himself the lie.

May we not fairly conjecture that this is Udall's own account of the circumstances of his dismissal? It is a significant fact that his place was filled immediately by a temporary successor, and subsequently by a Mr Tyndall, whom the Bishop of Carlisle, in acknowledging the letter conveyed by Udall from the Lord Privy Seal, calls 'your own true scholere and bedman.' Did the Lord Privy Seal want to get Udall out in order to put his own true scholar and bedeman in? Failing to inculpate him in the alleged robbery of plate, did he, partly by threats, partly by promises of paying his debts, induce him wrongfully to confess other offences which would be enough to justify his summary dismissal? Did Udall, some seven years after, finding all these promises vain, and feeling himself strong enough in court favour to defy his oppressor, resolve in this allegorical way to repudiate his fictitious confession, and to rehabilitate himself in the eyes of the public?

It only remains to add that I am indebted for the original suggestion that *Jacke Jugeler* was written by Nicholas Udall to Professor Bang.

W. H. Williams.

Hobart, Tasmania.

NOTES ON BEN JONSON, FROM A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY COMMON-PLACE BOOK.

RECENTLY there came into my possession a common-place book containing thirty-seven poems in an early seventeenth century hand. The volume seems to date from about 1640[1], although some poems were entered obviously as late as 1660. On the fly-leaf is written the name of a former owner, 'James Gough his Booke, Anno Dom: 1654.' The most interesting feature of this volume is a group of five poems dealing with Ben Jonson.

1. The first is a poem by Alexander Gill satirizing the *Magnetic Lady*. Gifford printed this poem from the Ashmole MSS. with the following comment[2]: 'It seems to have been hastily taken down by Ashmole or his amanuensis, and in one place there is apparently an omission of a line or more. It might perhaps be rendered somewhat more intelligible by a few obvious corrections, but I have preferred presenting it to the reader just as it stands in the only copy now perhaps in existence.' On the last point, of course, Gifford proves to have been mistaken. Since this new version supplies the omission noted by Gifford, corrects in a number of places both the metre and the text, and furnishes some variant readings of interest, I give it here in full.

To B Johnson on his Magnetick Lady.

Is this y^{r} Load-stone Ben that must attract
Applause and laughter at each scene and act?
Is this the child of your bed-ridden witt
And none but y^{e} black-friers to foster it?
If to the fortune you had sent your Lady,
Mongst prentises or applewives, it may be
Your Rosy foole might have some sport begott
With his strang habit & indefinite nott,
But when as silke and plush & all the witts
Are cal'd to see, and censure as befitts;
And if your folly take not, they perchance
Must here themselves stil'd Gentle Ignorance.

[1] A large part of the volume is devoted to political events of the year 1640.
[2] *The Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. in 3 vols., vol. ii. pp. 437–8.

Foh how it stinkes! what generall offence
Gives thy prophaneness such gross impudence?
O how y^r freind Natt: Butter gan to melt
When at the pooreness of your platt he smelt
And Inigo with laughter then grew fatt
That ther was nothing ther worth laughing att.
And yet thou crazy wretch art confident
Belching out full-mouth'd oathes w^th foule intent
Calling vs fooles and rouges vnletterd men
Poore narrow soules y^t cannot judge of BEN.
Yet what is worse after three shamefull foyles
The printer must be put to further toyles
Whereas indeede to vindicate thy fame
Th' hadst better given thy pamp[h]let to y^e flame,
Oh what a strange prodigious yeare t'wil bee!
If this thy play come forth in thirtie three;
Let Domes Day rather come on newe years eve
And of thy paper plague y^e world bereave.
Which plague I feare worse than a Serjant's bitt
Worse then infection or an ague fitt,
Worse then the Astronomers Divining lipps
Worse then three suns, a comet, or eclips:
Or if thy learned brother Allestree
(Whose Homer vnto thee for Poetrie)
Should tell of raine vpon St Swithins day.
And y^t should wash our harvest quite away.
As for y^e press if thy play must come to it
Let Tho: Purfoote or John Trundle[1] do it,
In such dull characters, as for releifes
Of fires and wracks wee find in begging breifes,
And in Cap-paper let it printed bee;
(Indeede brown paper is to good for thee)
But let it then be soe Apocryphall
As not to dare to venter on a stall
Vnless of Druggers, Grocers, Chandlers, Cooks,
Victuallers, Tobacco men, & such like rookes;
From bucklers bury let it not be bar'd
But thinke not of Duck lane, or Pauls-church-yard:
But to advise thee Ben in this strict age
A Brick-kilne's better for thee then a stage
Tho[u] better knowest a grounsel how to lay
Then lay the plott or groundworke of a play;
And better canst direct to cappe a chimny
Then to converse w^th Clio or Polyhymny,
Fall to thy trade in thy old age agen,
Take vp thy trugge and trowell gentle BEN;
Let playes alone, or if thou needs will write
And thrust thy feeble muse forth into light,
Lett Lowin cease and Taylor fear to touch
The loathed stage[2], for now thou makst it such.

ALEX: GILL.

2. Gill's poem is followed by 'Bens Answeare.' This version is much more perfect than that printed by Gifford. Indeed the latter is

[1] Who lived at the sign of 'Nobody.' He was ridiculed by Jonson in *Every Man in his Humour*, I. ii.: 'Ill be gelt, and troll ballads for Master John Trundle yonder.'

[2] Referring to Jonson's *Ode to Himself*, 'Come leave the loathed stage.'

so lame in its metre that in two places Gifford found it necessary to piece out the lines with conjectural insertions.

Bens Answeare.

Doth the prosperity of a pardon still
Secure thy raging rimes, Infamous Gill?
Art Libelling? Can no Starr Chamber peeres,
The Pillory, the whip, no loss of eares
(All wch thou hadst from thence deservedly)
No degradation from the ministry,
To be Demus of thy fathers schoole,
Keepe in thy barking wit, thou bawling foole,
From thinking to stirr me? thou hast thy end,
I laugh at thee, poore retched tyke; go send
Thy blatant muse a broad, and teach it rather
A tune to drown ye ballads of thy father,
For thou hast nothing left to cure his name
But tune and noyse ye ecchose of his shame;
A rogue by statute, censur'd to be whipt,
Cropt, branded, slitt, & neck-stockt; go
th'art stript.

3. This is followed by a poem, 'To B Johnson on Gil's rayling,' signed 'Townly.' Gifford has printed the poem from MS. Ashmole 38 (6907) fol. 59. The version in my volume follows the Ashmole version so closely (except for spelling) that I may content myself with merely recording the few variant readings.

l. 2, rimes Ash. rayles. l. 4, Which Ash. That. l. 6, few Ash. noe. l. 15, dur'st blast his name fully knowne Ash. dar'st to blast fame fully blown. l. 17, his Ash. thine. l. 18, had Ash. would.

4. Townly's poem is followed by 'Ben: Johnsons Ode to himselfe.' This version differs in many striking ways from that printed by Jonson at the end of *The New Inne* (1631), but agrees rather closely with the version printed after Jonson's death in *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, etc. (1640), and with the version in MS. Ashmole 38, printed by Dr G. B. Tennant in his edition of *The New Inn* (1908). The repeated occurrence of this peculiar version goes to substantiate Dr Tennant's theory that it represents Jonson's first draft of the poem circulated privately among his friends: 'Such inquiry,' says Dr Tennant, 'is pertinent in view of the fact that we have two copies [now three] of a version of this *Ode* which gives evidence of its having been written in the first bitterness of disappointment upon the failure of *The New Inn*.' Dr Tennant has given very good evidence to prove his contention, yet he has overlooked, I believe, the most important evidence of all. William Strode made a Latin translation of the *Ode*, a part of which is printed by Gifford. This translation agrees not with Jonson's own printed version, but with

the version under discussion, and thus furnishes a fourth copy of the poem in its original form.

It remains for me only to record the significant variants in the version before me. L. 10, for 'weare,' read 'are' (a much better reading); l. 27, 'sweeping,' read 'sweepings'; l. 29, 'these,' read 'those'; l. 33, 'braue,' read 'new'; l. 35, 'peyces,' read 'peeres' (obviously the correct reading); l. 46, 'hath,' read 'have'; ll. 49 f., 'straine,' 'braine,' read 'straines,' 'braines'; l. 51, 'But,' read 'And'; l. 53, 'of,' read 'o're'; l. 57, 'In,' read 'To'; l. 60, 'bone,' read 'o're.'

5. This poem is followed by Thomas Carew's 'To Ben: Johnson Vpon occasion of his Ode to him selfe.' A collation reveals no important variation from the text printed in Carew's works.

The following translation of Jerome Amaltheus's *Horologium Pulvereum* suggests at once a comparison with Jonson's well-known translation of the same poem made at the request of Drummond of Hawthornden. Drummond printed the poem at the end of his *Conversations*, and Jonson included it, in a slightly different version, in his *Underwoods*. Gifford adds another version (iii. 285) with the remark: 'It matters little which we take: the version in Drummond's folio is the worst, but all are imperfect.' It is worth noting that still another version appears in *Wits Recreations* (1640: Hotten's reprint, ii. 17).

On an hower glasse.

This glass y^{t} quite runs out to runne againe
Still getting its increasing by its waine
Mee thinkes should be the body long agoe
Of some deceased Amatorio
Who in his mistriss' flames playing y^{e} flye
Was burnt to dust, & ashes in her eye
And, as alive, so dead shewes how vnblest
Poore lovers are, whose ashes find no rest.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

ITHACA, N. Y.

SOME UNPUBLISHED POEMS OF DRUMMOND FROM THE HAWTHORNDEN MSS.

(*Continued from* Vol. VI. p. 334.)

In the July number 1911 of the *Modern Language Review* a certain number of unpublished poems of Drummond from the Hawthornden manuscripts appeared. A second and final batch is here published, but in the present instance two collaborators, both interested in the poetic achievement of the Scottish laird, have joined forces after having both independently gone over the same ground.

Most of the pieces presented here for the first time are evidently relatively early productions; this is shewn by the rather cramped style, and more plainly still by the traces of dialect, which in Drummond's later and published work are hardly perceptible.

Whatever their literary value may be (in our judgment it is not inconsiderable) these early poems are undoubtedly of no little importance in the light of the Scottish poet's development.

The first piece, of considerable length, offers an example of the eclogue, on the model of the Italian poets of the Cinquecento, a genre which Drummond, in spite of his predilection for Romance models, abandoned at a later stage.

Judging from the handwriting, the spelling, and the numerous emendations in a more correct hand, this is one of Drummond's early efforts, which has undergone subsequent revision.

Eclogue.

Damon and Moeris, by a christal spring
Wher a greene sicamour did make a schade,
And fairest floures the banckes all couering,
Theer oft to stay the wandring Nymphes had made,
While woods musicians from the trees aboue
On euerye branche did warble furth ther loue,

On grassie bed all tyrd themselues did lay
To schune suns heat and passe the tedious houres,
Delyting now to see theer lambkins play
Then to weaue garlands for theer paramours.
Damon tormentet was with Amarillis
And Moeris brunt in loue of fairest Phillis.

Phillis the louliest lasse that flockes ere fed
By Tanais siluer streames, whos heaunlie eie
In chaines of gold this shephard captiue led,
Or he knew what was loue or libertie.
Sweet Amarillis far aboue the rest
Of Askloua maids estimed the best.

In curious knotes while thay theer worke adorne,
Mixing pyed dezies with sad violets,
Whit lilies with that flour which like the morne
Doth blush and beautie to the garland sets,
Damon, whom loue and woes had sore dismaid,
Thus gan to say or Loue thus for him said:

Faire Tanais Nymphes & ye Nymphes of the woods,
Which usse in schadie groues to dance and sing,
Ye Montaine sisters, sisters of the floods,
On softest sand which oft are carroling,
Heere bring your flours and this garland make faire
To set vpon my Phillis amber haire.

Do not disdaine to be a schade, sweet flours,
To fairest tresses under which doth grow
The rose and lilie far excelling yours,
The red cinabre and the milke whit snow.
About her temples when I sal you place
Them you cannot (sweet floures) they shall you grace.

Suouft winged archers & ye sea-borne queene,
In Mirrhas child if yee tooke ere delight,
If ere with flames your hart hath touched beene,
Enambushd lie you by this red and whit,
That when her lockes this coronet anademe sall part,
A hundred Cupids may steal to her hart.

Her hart then coldest Alpine yce more cold,
Mor hard, yet precious as the diamond,
The noblest conquest that with dart of gold
Loue ever made, since he culd shoot or wound.
But he that fort not darring to essay
Contents you with her eyes & ther doth play.

Now Ceres twise hath cut her yellow lockes,
The swellow twise the spring about hath brocht,
Twise hath we waind the yonglins of our flockes,
Since I alas was forc't, & al for naught,
Be cruel her to cry, weep & complaine
Vnto this montaine, forrest, riuer, plaine.

My flockes sem'd partneres of ther masters woe:
The Bell-bearer, the troupes that vsd to lead,
His usuall feading places did forgoe,
And lothing three-leu'd grasse hold up his head;
The walkes, the groues which I did hant of yore
My fate and Phillis hardnesse seemed deplore.

The goate-foote syluans under schadie trees
Did solemnize the accents of my plent
With grones; the watrie Nymphes with weeping
And wide spred lockes oft I haue seen lament.
Among the rest a Nymphe sueet, wanton, gay,
Rising aboue the streames thus hard I say:

Phillis, sweet honor of these suetest woods,
Wert thou but pitiful as thow art faire,
The worthiest gem of al our Tanais floods;
But as in beautie so in hardness rare
To al thes graces that so do grace the;
Ah, learne to loue, and no mor cruel be!

The flowres, the gemmes, the mettales, all behold,
The lambes, the eues, the gold spangl'd bremes in streames,
Al thes be workes of loue; the Tygresse bold
Made mild by loue her in-bred furie teames;
In heauen, earth, aire, since all where loue we see,
O, learne to loue, and no more cruel be!

In toilesome paines to wast our virgin yeares
And louelesse liue, is not to liue, but breath;
Loue is the tree which most contentment beares,
Whose fruits euen make us liue beyond our death;
Sweet loue did make thy Mother bring forth thee;
Ah, learne to loue, and no more cruel be!

Earths best perfections doth but last short time;
Riche Aprils treasure pleaseth much the eie;
But as it grows it passeth in its prime.
Thinke, & well thinke, thy beautie thus must dye;
When with wan face thow sal loke in thy glasse
Then sal thow sigh: would I had lou'd, alas!

Looke but to Cloris, louing lou'd againe,
How glad, how merillie, sche spends each daye,
Like cherful vine whom chaste elme doth sustaine,
While her sweet yonglings doe about her play;
When thow the want sal find of such a grace
Then sal thow sigh: would I had lou'd, alas!

But who is Damon whom thow suld disdaine:
The heauens on him some gifts hath euen let fal;
Gay is hee; wealth his cabane doth containe.
He loues the much, & that is more than al;
If crueltie thy loue in him deface,
Then sal thow say: would I had lou'd, alas!

Flora him lou'd, if ere in clearest brooke
Narcissus like thy face thow did admire,
As faire as thow, yet Flora he forsooke
With al her gifts, & foole did the desire.
If he his thochts againe on Flora place,
Then sal thow sigh: would I had lou'd, alas!

This said the Nymphe, & ther with al sche sanke
The clearest streame beneath, who al dismaid
At her depart come playing to the banke,
And on his face a hundred frownes bewrayed.
I lay as on whom some strange dreame makes wake,
Then homward to my cabane did me take.

The floods sal backward to ther fontaines rune;
The spring shall want its floures; the pleasant floures
On barren rockes sal grow depriu'd of sune;
The sune sal leaue the heuens tuelve shining boures;
Heuens without starres sal be; starres cease to moue;
Ere euer I my Phillis leaue to loue.

Pant doth my hart when I thinke on that day,
That fatal day, when sche with looshung haire
And whitest petticot in new borne may,
To gather floures, did to our meeds repaire,
While I did rest beneath an ancient oke,
Caring for nocht but how to fead my flocke.

I saw her rune and as sche ran me thocht
The feilds about did smyle; beside the streames
Then sat schee down, where sune to kisse her sought;
But schee with waile eclipsd his wanton beames.
I hard her breath few words, with loue and feare
To which winds, mountaines, woods, did len their eare.

Deceiu'd perchance with that most liulie hew,
A bee did hurt her lip that mad her weep,
And moisten cheekes faire flowers with sweetest dew,
Which semed to fal, but cupid did it keep;
For when rebellious harts gainstand his dart
He steeps it in thes teares, and then thay smart.

Withal sche rose, & in watrie floods glasse
Angerlie mild the litil wound to looke,
Her selff sche drest, but Kala coming was
Who made her stay, & so her mande sche tooke,
Of golden wonderes to make poore the Mead,
While on her face my hungry eyes did feed.

At sight of her { red / plump } lips blush did the rose;
To see her vaines the violets grew paile;
The Marigold her precious leaues did close,
Amazd to find her haire so farre preuaile;
The lilies in her hand apeard not whit.
Thus dazel'd was my sight with sueet delight.

Ourchargd at last sche to her village went,
Leauing a thousand diuerse thoughts in mee,
Like ciuill foes tumultuouslie which vent
All their best strenghtes till all euanish'd be.
Then tyrd with wo I laid me in my bed,
Wher al the Nyt the Hyacynthe I red.

What wonder her sueet eies culd me beguile,
Which kendle desire then when thay utter breath,
And euen when sche wald froune yet seme to smile,
Life promising when most thay threaten death!
For these faire tuines I rather stil be sad
Then by anothers loue even be made glad.

Hawthornden MSS. x., pp. 108—114.

The next of the longer pieces is likewise an eclogue in much the same style, which, however, has not been subject to revision on the author's part.

Eclogue.

Syrenus. Montanus.

Sy. While dayes bright coachman makes our schadows short,
And panting rests him in his halff dayes course;
While gladder shephards giue themselves to sport,
Let us deare Montane rest us by this source,
Wher we may stanche our thrist with coldest streames,
And under schade be freed of Phebus beames.

M. Content am I; but since Syluanus left
This earthlie round I neuer like that spring,
The wearie place from me my ioyes hath reft,
When I behold wher he was wont to sing,
Syluane well knowne, the honor of our woods,
Who made the rocks to heare & stayed the floods.

Sy. Bewaile not Syluane, since he's releu'd
Of fleschlie bonds and thes our mortal toiles,
With sad misfortunes now he is not grieuet.
This earth is framd for deaths triumphing spoiles;
The pleasant leaues, the suetest flours decayes,
And fairest things doth last the fewest dayes.

M. Th'enuyous heauens, befor the course of time,
Stole the from earth for to enrich their spheares,
While scars thow flourish't in thy youthful prime,
Filling our harts with woe, our eies with teares.
Syren, for thes deare dayes that heer thow spent,
Stay not my grief but help me to lament.

Sy. If floods of teares from the elysian plaine
Culd call a happie gost, if sighes culd giue
A sparke of lyff, then Phillis schoures of rain
And lasting grones might make him yet to liue.
Yet in remembrance of this orphane place,
And her I murne, I'l sing with the a space.

M. A stream of teares, poore riuer chrystalline,
Len these mine eies; so may along thy banks
Sueet roses, lilies, & the colombine,
In pleasant flourish keep theer statlie ranks,
To washe Syluanus Tombe, that of my sorrow
The floods, the hils, the mids, a part may borrow.

Sy. Len me the voice that Boreas hath the giuen,
Stracht reachet pin, when he his blows redoubles;
So may thy loftie head mont vp to heauen,
& neare heareafter feare his angry troubles,
That my sad accents may surpasse the skies,
& make heuens echoes answer to my cries.

M. Forests, since your best darling now is gone,
Who your darke schadows suetnet with his layes,
Teache al your nightingales at once to grone;
Cut your greene lockes; let fal your palmes & bayes;
Let not a mirtil tree be in yow found,
But eurie wher with cypress sad abound.

Sy. Faire Midows, from whos tender bosome springs
The white Narcissus, Venus deare delight,
The Hyacinth, & others who wer kings
And ladies faire when thay enioyd this light,
In mourning blake your princely coulours die;
Bow down your heads, while sighing zephires flee.

M. What now is left vnto this plane but weeping?
This litil flood, that sometime did inuite
Our wearied bodies to sueet rest and sleeping,
With his soft murmur semes to waile our plight,
Telling the rocks, the banks, wheerere he goes,
& the wyde ocean, our remedlesse woes.

Sy. As Philomela sight upon a tree,
Me thocht (for what thinks not a troublet mind?)
With her own grieues, amids her harmonie,
Syluanus death, our losse, sche oft combined,
Wherto tuo widow turtles lent theer eares,
Syne planed that Nature had not giuen them teares.

M. The earth, althocht cold winter kil her flowres,
And al her beautie eurie wher deface,
When Phebus turns into his hoter boures,
Made ful of lyff, smiles with her former grace.
But so soone as, alas, mans giuen to death,
No sunne againe doth euer make him breath.

Sy. The Moone that sadlie cheers the gloomie night,
When sche in deaths blake armes a while remaines,
New borne, doth soone recev her siluer light
And queenlike glances or the silent plaines;
The stare sunke in the west again doth rise.
But man, forgot, in vglie horror lies.

M. Ah souueraine poures, when ye did first deuise
To make poor man, why brak ye not the molde?
With fleschie maskes why did ye sprits disguise?
Caussing a glasse so foole that liquor hold,
With cryes & paine him bringing to the light.
Happie t'haue sleepe in an eternal Night.

Sy. Happie t'haue sleepe in an eternal Night,
& neuer interrup that silent rest,
He felt no woes if he had no delight;
He did not know what's euil; of nocht what's best;
If he vsd not th'vnperfyt peece of reason,
He feard not woes to come at eurie season.

M. If that I war againe for to be framd,
& that the heuens wald freelie to me giue
What of the things below I suld be made,
A hart, a doue, I rather choose to liue,
Then be a man, my losses stil lamenting,
Tost first with passion, then with sore repenting.

Sy. If I was one of yow, my sille lambes,
I suld not beene oprest with th'vncuth caires
That mankind hath, nor felt the cruel flames
Of Phillis eies, nor knowne what was despaire.
Sueet harmless flocke, when as ye stray alone,
Are ye affraid of styx or phlegeton?

M. The mids are not embled with so manie floures,
So many hews heuens neuer doth borrow,
So many drops hath not the april schoures,
As we poore wretchet men hath worlds of sorrow.
For thes, o glorious gifts of noble skies,
With bitter teares ye fillet hath our eies.

Sy. With bitter teares ye fillet hath our eies,
And fostreth with beguiling hope our mind,
With promist good that doth us stil intice.
Lo, seeke we we wot not what, and so mad blind
We follow lies and change to taste of ioyes,
But hauing changd we find but new annoyes.

M. If lies bred ioyes and vertue bring woe,
Fals thochts be ful of comfort, trewth of sadness,
Welcome braue lies of that I neuer know!
Unhappie trewth to take from me my gladness;
For thocht we weep our woes we cannot mend them,
& we may end ourselves before we end them.

x. pp. 115—119.

The two that follow are manifestly literary exercises after the manner of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia.*

Fragment.

Like unto her nothing can be namd.
The mold is broke wherin, dear, sche was framd.
Who may of her rare beautie count ich part,
And all thes gifts heauen doth to her impart,
On Affricke shores the sand that ebs & flows,
The skalie flockes that with old Proteus goes,
He sur may count, and al thes waues that meet
To washe the Mauritanian Atlas feet—
Her curlet haire, faire threeds of finest gold,
In nets & curious knots mens harts to hold;
Her forhead large & euen of which the lilies
Do borrow beautie & the daffodilies;
Faire ebaine bows aboue her heunlie eies,
Wher tratrous loue in silent ambush lies;
Well framd her nose; her cheekes with purest red,
Cinabre like, most dantelie are spred;
Prettie & schort her eares; with heunlie smiles
Her visage schind that sadest eies beguiles;
To orient perles her teeth do nothing yeild,
Nor lips to coral, or of gueles a feild.
Juno with maiestie, & faire aurore
With blush & fingers did this sueet decore;
The Graces gaue theer smiles and did reioice
To heare her sing with Phebus heaunlie voice;
Pallas gave wit; the vertews gaue theer part:
Liuing the heauen they loget in her heart. x. pp. 64—65.

Fragment.

A faire, a sweet, a pleasant heunlie creature
Lycoris was—the miracle of Nature:
Her haire more faire then gold of Tagus streames,
Or his that cheeres the world with golden beames;
Her suetest mouth, & lips that halff shee closes,
Did nothing yeild to corral & fresh roses;
Her brow more white, more beautiful, & gay
Then is a day but clouds in mids of May,
Under the which two equal planets glancing
Cast flames of loue; for loue theer stil is dancing.
While jurie, with a dantiest purple spred,
Of her faire cheeks resembld the fairest red.
Her neck semd framed by some most curious master,
Most white, most smoth, a piece of alabaster;
Upon her brest two aples round did grow,
With tops of strawberries more white then snow:
So far in grace sche did excell each other
That Cupid wald haue taine her for his mother. x. p. 64.

In the piece that follows we see Drummond of Hawthornden appearing in the rôle of a French poet, and addressing his friend and contemporary Alexander of Menstrie, subsequently Earl of Stirling, in a series of somewhat hobbling Alexandrines. These verses, undoubtedly written in Drummond's hand, do not, it is true, bear his signature, but the very faulty versification (the elision of the *i* of *qui* in ll. 2 and 5, and the use of the lyric feminine cæsura in ll. 9, 15 and 16), preclude the possibility that we may be in presence of a copy of verses by some unknown French poet. Defective as these lines are they afford a further testimony to the Laird of Hawthornden's familiarity with French.

Sur les œuures poetiques de Guillaume Alexandre, Sieur De Menstre.

Menstre, mignon de Pinde, astre des escossois,
le premier entre nous qu'osa toucher le bois
du docte Delien, faisant le monde entendre
les bourdons de ton luth, cõme vn autre Terpandre.
Esprit des bons esprits. qu'a charmè par ta vois
la dure Mort, et fait reuivre les grands rois,
a bon droict, maintenant, qu'on peut nommer Monarque,
Puisque par ton scauoir il ont vaincu les Parques,
ces rois qui te doyvent autant de lauriers
que leurs bras ont dontè des peuples guerriers.
tout ce n'estoit assez, au comble de ta gloire,
tu ensignas l'amour aux filles de Memoire :
le Pau devint honteux, Seine cacha son chef
a peine le monstrant au soleil derechef ;
les Charites dansent ; Amour ses traits redore
et aueugle s'estonne, voyant ta belle Aurore.
Dedans ta bouche naisse une manne de miel ;
Tousiours ton nom Douen alle bruant au ciel ;
Tousiours sois tu aimè d'Apollon et ton prince,
Fils aisnè de Pallas, l'honneur de ta prouince !

x. p. 163 (*v*).

More important, though only indirectly germane to the topic in hand, is a copy of a sonnet, in praise of Maitland of Ledington, by the French Hugenot poet Guillaume Salluste, Lord of Bartas, the author of the famous *Weeks*, whose extraordinary vogue, more particularly in Scotland, was further advanced there by royal patronage and emulation.

As the sonnet in question has not, as far as we are aware, been printed in any of the numerous editions of the poetical works of Du Bartas, we may be excused for reproducing it here :

A Monsieur de Ledinton, Chancelier et grand secretarye d'Escosse.

Ledinton, quand ie voye vne presse flottante
Qui s'entrecoudoyant t'importune et te suit,
O combien (di ie lors) vn grand esprit nous nuit,
O que cher est l'honneur qui sans fin nous tourmente !

Mais quand, sans te peiner, ta bouche d'or contente
Vn peuple qui bouillant ses affaires poursuit,
Que je te voye collè au travaill iour et nuit,
O, di ie, clair(e) esprit qui vit calme en tourmente,
Robuste tu sustiens tout l'estat escossois ;
Tu veilles pour ton roy, claire perle des roys ;
Franc d'Ennuis quelquefois ton ame au ciel s'enuole.
O plus fort qu'vn Hercule, o plus fort qu'un Atlas,
Tu portes (Ledinton) l'Escosse dans tes bras,
Ton prince dans ton cœur, dans ton cerueau le pole !

Par Guillaume Saluste, Sieur du Bartas. 1587.

Among the sonnets, still numerous in France at that time, penned during the reign of Henry IV, none caused so much stir in literary circles and at court, as that of the poet De Porchères on the eyes of Henry's beautiful mistress, Gabrielle d'Estrée, Marquise de Monceaux. It was much imitated and translated both in France and in other countries, and of the numerous translations that by Drummond is by no means the worst:

De Porcheres, on the eies of Madame la Marquise de Monceaux, vret this sonnet.

Ce ne sont pas des yeux, ce sont plustost de[s] dieux :
ils ont dessus les rois la puissance absoluë.
Dieux, non, ce sont des cieux : ils ont la couleur bluë,
et le mouuement prompt comme celuy des cieux.
Cieux, non, mais deux soleils clairement radieux,
dont les rayons brillans nous offusquent la veuë.
Soleils, non, mais esclairs de puissance incognuë,
des foudres de l'Amour signes presageux,
Car s'ils estoient des dieux, feraient ils tant de mal ?
Si des cieux, ils auroient leur mouuement esgal.
deux soleils ne se peut : le soleil est unique.
esclairs, non, car ceux-cy durent trop et trop clairs.
toutefois ie les nomme, afin que ie m'explique,
des yeux, des dieux, des cieux, des soleils, des esclairs.

Thus englished.

Wer these thine eies, or lightnings from aboue,
Whose glistring glances dazel'd so my sight ?
I tooke them to be lightnings sent from Joue
To threten that theer thunder bolt wald light.
but lightnings could not last so long so bright.
thay rather semed for to be suns, whose rayes
Promou'd to the Meridian of their might,
did change my noisome nights in joyful dayes.
but euen in that theer nomber them bewrayes
suns ar thay not : the world endures but one.
theer force theer figure & theer coulour sayes
that thay ar heuens, but heuens on earth ar none.
be what thay wil, theer poure in force agrees :
the heauens, the sunne, the lightnings, and her eies.

VIII. (*in fine*).

The piece that follows again shows Drummond practising translation from French.

To Anne, the French Queen, new come from Spaine, and applyable to Marye of England, meeting the King at Douer.

Enfin la voici, nous voyons ces beaux yeux,
L'amour de la terre et des cieux,
Dont notre Mars, en son choix bienheureux,
Est si fort amoureux.
Le ciel n'a iamais ioint à tant de beauté
Vn[e] si douce Maiesté,
Qui dans le cœur inspire, tour à tour,
Le respect et l'amour.
Enfin la voyci, nos vœux sont accomplis,
Nos esprits d'aise remplis.
Puisse en tous deux, par un heureux destin,
Viure un amour sans fin!

At length here shee is: wee haue got those bright eyes.
More shine now our earth than the skyes!
And our Mars, happye in his high desire,
Is all flame by this fire.

The spheeres in so heunlye face neuer fixed
High state with so meeke graces mixed,
Which in all hearts about it round inspires
True respect & chast fires.

At length both are met: our designes crowned are;
Each soule in the ioy hath a share.
May in both brestes this Isle of Vnion giue
Onlye one hart to liue! VIII.

The madrigals, and short pieces of that kind, are represented by the following, of which the first appears with variations among the poems first printed by David Laing in *Archaeologia Scotica* (vol. IV., p. 107).

Of Anthea.

When Hylas saw the eyne
Of Anthea his loue,
Who e're (said hee) such burning lampes hath seene,
Vnlesse in Heauen aboue?
Shee at his sillie praise
With blush more faire became.
In vaine (said hee) cheekes [in] skies that Morne doe raise,
For my hart cannot feele a greater flame.
X. p. 33.

In asshe her lies the wanton God of loue,
By her whom for I die.
For longtyme hauing hee
Bent all his powrs her marble hart to moue,
In spite of dart of gold
And torch of heunlye fire
That neere would know desire,
Nay what is strange mor harder grew & cold,
Hee doubting if the flame vnquencht remaned the same,
Wherwith hee heuen and earth did burne of old,
Proud on himselfe his brandones force,
Which, ere hee wist, consumd his little corse. X. p. 41.

On the lut of Margarite.

The harmonie wherto the heauens doe dance,
Keeping to curious notes a suoft cadance,
Nor al Joues quiristers ar not so suet
As is the voice & lut of Margarite.
If angry with his sheares he had vndoone thee,
Her onlie voice wald serue againe to tune thee;
If he phlegrean squadrons wald bring under,
Her lut wald combat better then his thunder.

x. 165 (*v*).

Idas to schunne sunnes beames
Did soune in cristal flood.
Perchance, like faire Aurore,
At Ganges bankes, Phillis came to the shore.
He lookt wher as sche stood,
And stracht did burne amidst these coldest streames.

x. p. 174.

O most perfidious face
That hauing lost thy loue
Dost yet retaine thy wonted hew and grace!
Thy smyling eyes did say
Thy splendour should be gone,
Thy cheekes faire roses fade
And furrowed be with wrinkles shown,
Ere thy affection any whit decay,
Which now is cold & dead.
Now, Tyme, $\left.\begin{matrix}\text{poste,}\\ \text{haste,}\end{matrix}\right\}$ make her old:
In siluer turne her locks, her face like gold.

x. p. 241 (*v*).

This Monument vnder
Doth lie the wonder
Of that faire brest which Loue dar'd neuer tuch.
His courage kill'd him; but was it not much
A flea should bold and naked without armes
Of Loueres wronged thus reuenge the harmes?
Amantes proprio aere
Mi lite bene merenti posuere. x. p. 54 (*v*).

The Hawthornden manuscripts contain a large number of epigrams, a good proportion of which are here omitted because of their excessive coarseness. It is never an easy matter to determine the paternity of these trifles, which were frequently passed on from one commonplace book to another. Although we have taken due precautions by careful enquiry in various quarters before ascribing to Drummond the paternity of those we quote, we still feel some hesitation as regards two or three of them, and invite readers of the *Modern Language Review* to correct any error into which we may have lapsed.

On a noble man who died at a counsel table.

Untymlie Death that neither wouldst conferre
Discourse nor parley with our great Treasurer,
Had thou beene as hee was, or one of his tribe,
Thou wouldst have spar'd his life & tane a Bribe.

Hee who so long, with gold and subtil wit,
Had iniur'd strong law, & almost conquerd it,
Hee who could lenthen causes and was able
To sterue a suiter at the counsel Table,
At lenth, not hauing euidents to show,
Was faine (Good lord) to take's Death. It was so.

VIII.

Epitaph.

Heere lyes a Docter, who with droges and pelfe
Could not corrupt Death, but dyed himselfe.

VIII.

Epitaph.

Heer lyes a cooke, who went to buye ylles,
But met death in the Market who turned up his heeles.

VIII.

That which preserueth cherries, peares and plumes
Can not preserue the liuer, lights and lungs.

VIII.

A lady in her prime to whom was giuen
As much perfection as could flow from Heauen,
Who, had shee liud when good was loud of men,
Had made the Graces fiue, the Muses ten.

VIII.

Strange is his end, his death most rare and od,
Who made his god his gold, his gold his god.

VIII.

Killd by ingratitude heere blest within doth rest:
To marye or not to marye which is best.

VIII.

Epigrammes.

Mops gaue his fath to Anne and Helen, yet doth ow:
Quho sayes good Mopsus hath no fath he lies, for he hath tuo.

x. p. 158.

Tom moneyless his agnus dei hath sold,
for he had rather want his God than gold.

x. p. 158.

Paul went to Toune to save himselfe from horning;
Scarse was he gone, when Kite him hornd that morning.

x. p. 165.

On the poems of——.

Thocht poets skil he vant, thinke it no crime,
for he knows nocht of poesie but rime.

x. p. 165.

Zoilus eies in glasse did see themselues looke euen:
That each of them micht gree, then both did pray to heauen.

x. p. 165.

A foolish change made wretchet Chremes dead:
his hairs gat gold, and thay left him but lead.

x. p. 165 (*v*).

Jeanne cal not your husband hart when ye him kis:
The harts do losse ther horns, but he keeps euer his.

x. p. 165 (*v*).

Why byeth old Chremes land so near his death?
Like loueth like: he halfe earth liketh earth.

x. p. 166.

Thocht louers lie, borne by the streame of yuth,
Yet when thay say ther dames no mortal creatures
Can be, but something els, sure thay say truth:
Women adord in feinds do change ther natures.
x. p. 166.

Into the sea Thomas al cornards wist,
But his faire wyff to suyme bad him learne first.
x. p. 166.

Chremes did hing himselff upon a tree,
Because the price of Ceres fruits did alter.
His seruant ran and cut the rope, but he,
Com'd to himselff, socht monnoye for the halter.
x. p. 166.

Be reasons good thou him a christian proueth:
H'il drinke strong wine, & flesh of suine wel loueth. x. p. 166.

Charles the IX of France.

Why vomits Charles so much blood from his brest?
The bloud he drank he culd not well digest. x. p. 173.

Out of Passerat.

Who cuckhold is & tries it not,
A honest man he is God wot.
Who well it sees yet wil not see,
A wise subtile man is hee.
Who searcheth if his head be hornd,
At best is worthie to be scornd. x. p. 173.

Samarias Motheres when to Death they steru'd
Did make a couenant their sonnes to eate.
The first (poor foole) aduanced hers for meate,
The other, pitifull, hid and preseru'd:
Comparisons are odious, therefore I
To Britannes kingdome will not this applye. x. p. 178.

Two bittes of Noses may make on tall nose.
Philip on Nose-bit had Leslea another.
Leslea a goodlye piece to make of those
Determinates to ioyne the two together.
But when Philps nose should but haue been his pray,
He tooke his head: lords was not that foule playe?
x. p. 184.

Epitaph.

Truth hatred breedes.
Who lyes beneath this stone
Thou shalt not know.
Yet know hee's not alone:
About him staye some findes for his euill deedes.
Let him who reedes
In haste this place foregoe. x. p. 186.

Discontented Phillis.

Blacke are my thoughts as is my husbands haire;
My fortune ill proportion'd like his face;
My mind wants joyes, his countenance all grace;
His wit is lead, myne heauye is with care.
In things so great since so $\left.\begin{matrix}\text{like}\\ \text{conforme}\end{matrix}\right\}$ wee be,
Who then can say but that wee will agree. x. p. 197.

Here lye the bones of a gentle horse
Who liuing used to carrye the corse
Of an insolent preacher. O had the asse
Of Balaam him carryed, he had told what he was!
Now courteous readers tell so, if yee can,
Is the Epitaph of the horse or of the Man.

x. p. 224.

Vindiciae against the Commones for B. C.

Some are that thinke it no way can agree
A Bishop good good Minister can bee,
Nay, that no more be in one man these can
Than to be honest and a Puritan.
How farre they runne astray and strangelie erre,
This Man showes, Man good, Bishop, Minister.
Onlie one fault hee had, for he did proue
Too meeke for this world, too too much a doue.
Hence harmelesse liu'd hee and exposed to wronges,
And now lyes murdered by iniurious tongues.
Such which talke still of Relligion,
Yet hold it best in practike to haue none,
Who deeme men like to him to be great euille,
May God to preach to them raise up some [deuill!]

x. p. 204.

L. E. KASTNER.
E. AUDRA.

MANCHESTER.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF 'S' IN GERMANIC.

THE familiar rule of alliterative technique which requires that initial *s-* when followed by a voiceless explosive shall only alliterate with *s* + the same explosive and not with a single *s-* or with *s* + any other explosive, or with *s* + any consonant other than a voiceless explosive, would appear to throw some little light on the speech habits of the Germanic peoples and may at the same time perhaps find its explanation in those speech habits.

The necessity of alliterating *sp-* only with *sp-* and not with *sk-* or *sn-* or *s-* or any other combination than *sp-* can only be accounted for on the assumption that the latter alliteration failed, in some way not self-evident, to satisfy the essential requirements of alliteration. The essential requirement of alliteration, as of rime and assonance, may be said to be the recurrence of sounds which in their acoustic effects are identical. The question of vowel alliteration may be left out of the question for the present, and we are therefore forced to the conclusion that in the inadmissible alliteration of *sp-* with *sn-* there is such a difference in the acoustic effect of the *s* as to destroy the impression of identity.

It should be noticed that initial *s-* can alliterate freely either with itself or with *s* + any consonant except a voiceless explosive, so that one may assume that in such positions the acoustic value of *s-* was always the same. On the other hand *s-* cannot alliterate with *sp-*, *sk-*, *st*, and therefore we may assume that these three combinations formed a closed group with some special distinguishing features of their own, one of which must be a different acoustic value of the initial *s-*. It may however be urged that if we deduce different values of *s-* from the inadmissibility of the alliteration *sp-* : *sn-* we may also deduce different values of *s-* from the inadmissibility of the alliteration *sp-* : *sk-*. This however is not a valid objection; for, as we have seen, *sp-*, *sk-*, *st-*, form a group by themselves, and hence the cause of the special treatment of

this *group* may also be the cause of the special treatment of members *within* the group, and this we shall see to be the case.

Moreover *s-* may alliterate with *sn-* or *sl-* or *s* followed by any consonant except a voiceless explosive, and the consonant plays no determining role in the alliteration; but in the combinations *st-*, *sp-*, *sk-*, the consonant *does* play a determining role, in so far as it participates and must participate in the alliteration. Consequently, if *st-* cannot alliterate with *sp-* it is because of the difference of consonant and not because of any difference in the value of the *s-*.

We are thus forced to the conclusion that whereas the acoustic value of *s-* in the groups *st-*, *sp-*, *sk*, is the same, or, at any rate, not necessarily different, this acoustic value differs from the value of *s-* in all other combinations. It remains to enquire wherein this difference consists.

It can scarcely be said to be a difference of articulation or quality, for the *s-* was in all probability articulated in the same way in *sm-*, *sn-*, etc., as in *st-*, *sp-*, *sk*, since there is nothing, phonetically speaking, to shift the articulation—the articulation of *sm-* corresponds exactly (if we except the nasal factor of the *m*) to that of *sp-* and *sn-* to *st-*. Rather we should expect to find the difference in the stress or quantity of the *s-*. A little experiment will immediately show that *s-* followed by a continuant is of much greater length and much more clear and distinct acoustically than an *s-* followed by a voiceless stop. The manner of articulation of the groups *st-* and *sn-* confirms this experience, for in the pronunciation of *st-* the current of air is cut off at a very early stage in order to form the position for the *-t-*. In the group *sn-*, on the other hand, the current of air is not cut off at all in the transition from the *s-* to the *-n-*, and hence the acoustic effect of the *s-* is much stronger when the latter sound is followed by a continuant.

In the case of *st-*, *sp-*, *sk-* the first sound is, as it were, subordinated to, and almost swallowed up by, the explosion which follows it. In the case of strongly stressed or aspirated explosives the effect of the initial *s-* would be still less. Thus it is that if in a large room somebody at a distance cries out 'Speech!' the *s-*, though by nature a more sonorous sound than a *p*, and one which carries further, is yet lost in this case and the *-p-* is heard more clearly than the *s-*. In this partial suppression of initial *s-* by a succeeding explosive is doubtless to be found the explanation of the rule which requires the alliteration of *sp-* with *sp-*, etc., more especially since the old Germanic poetry was composed for the ear, intended for large audiences, and frequently recited in the open air. It

was felt, no doubt, that since the explosive was the predominating initial sound and not the spirant, the explosive should participate in the alliteration.

The whole question may also be approached from another side. Jespersen has already pointed out (*Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, § 192 ff.) that a syllable consists of a rise in sonority up to the head of the syllable and of a fall in sonority from the head of the syllable to its end. The initial groups *st-*, *sp-*, *sk-* would seem however to be at variance with this principle, in so far as *s* is a more sonorous sound than *p*. This difference in sonority is however very slight in the case of *s* and *t*, *p*, or *k*, and is further reduced by weakening the expiratory force of the *s-*, as we have seen above. If the difference of sonority had been more marked, as for example between *m* + *p*, the combination would have been impossible at the beginning of a syllable. The initial groups *sp-*, *st-*, *sk-* are, in any case, very unstable at the beginning of a syllable and would appear to survive only on one of three conditions:

(i) Either the initial *s-* becomes the final *-s* of a prefixed syllable, *e.g.* Latin *strictum* > Fr. *estroit*, Lat. *studium* > Fr. *estude*, Lat. *spiritum* > Fr. *esprit*.

(ii) Or the explosive is pronounced with greater articulatory stress (cf. Guinecken, *Principes de linguistique psychologique*, Paris, 1907, § 531).

(iii) Or the quantity (and hence the sonority) of the *s-* is reduced.

That *s* in the groups *st-*, etc. is subject to special modifications due to speech habit may also be seen from the comparison of initial *st-* with final *-st*. In the latter, in such a word as 'fast,' the passage from *s* to *t* represents a perfectly normal descent in sonority and therefore *s* is not weakened in any way and is a clear and distinct sound. Far from being in any way affected by the final *t*, it frequently gains in length at the expense of the *t*, as in 'a fast train' = 'ə fās trein' or 'a fast boat' = 'ə fās bout.' It is true that in these cases the loss of the final *t* may be due to the difficulty of pronouncing *t* + *t* or *b*, but the important fact remains that in this position the *s* retains its character, whereas in the initial position it modifies its character. So also in such a word as 'fāsn̥' (fasten) if we divide the syllables 'fas-sten' we can readily see why the *t* disappears with compensation lengthening of the *s*, instead of weakening the *s* and keeping the *t*. If, indeed, in modern English we preserve the *t*, then the syllabication immediately becomes 'fās-ten' (just as in 'of-ten' as distinguished from 'oft').

If, then, initial *s* in the groups *st-*, etc., is a weakened *s*, coalescing, as it were, with the following explosive, it becomes clear that *sp-* can only alliterate with *sp-*, and *sk-* with *sk-*, etc., because these groups alone satisfied the requirement of identical recurring sounds, and it would also appear that this identity was interpreted more strictly than is commonly supposed. The conclusion that complete identity of sound alone sufficed is further borne out by the investigations of R. M. Meyer (*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, XXVI, 149), who discovers a strong tendency in old Germanic poetry to alliterate two initial consonants instead of one.

Incidentally it might be observed that this may throw some light on the current theories of vowel-alliteration. One of these theories assumes the glottal catch to have been the alliterating element in vowel alliteration, and has often been called in question on other grounds. If, however, *sp-* could not alliterate with *st-* because the *s* sound was too weak, how shall we believe that the glottal catch—a still less sonorous sound—should have constituted the alliteration before initial vowels?

E. CLASSEN.

MANCHESTER.

ON SOME ETYMOLOGIES OF ENGLISH WORDS.

THESE notes deal with the non-Germanic, for the most part with the Romanic, element in Prof. Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, ed. 4, 1910 (S.D.). I have taken this dictionary as my starting-point, because in this marvellous compendium of etymological research it must be allowed that, generally speaking, we may find the latest word that scholars have to say on the derivation of English words.

I. *Some Etymologies suggested in the place of those advanced in S.D.*

AISLE. S.D. gives the usual derivation from Fr. *aile* a wing. I would suggest that in the modern word two distinct words have been confused together. The consideration of the forms given in N.E.D. points to two distinct sources, namely, Lat. *ala* (Fr. *aile*) and Lat. *insula* (Fr. *île*). In our 'aisle' the pronunciation points to an original connexion with the word *isle*, whereas the spelling is a contaminated spelling of Fr. *isle* (whence the *s*) and Fr. *aile* (whence the *ai*-). The history of this architectural term seems to show that '*isle*' was the predominant partner. The spelling *ile* (*isle*) was the ordinary spelling of the word from the beginning of the fifteenth century to the middle of the eighteenth century. Pope writes *isle* in *Eloisa to Abelard* and *ile* in *The Temple of Fame*. *Aisle* is quite a modernism, only hesitatingly admitted by Johnson in 1755, and has no direct connexion with the early English forms *ele*, *eil* derived from Fr. *ele* and Lat. *ala*, cited in N.E.D.

AITCH-BONE. S.D. gives the dialect word *ice-bone* as one of the forms of *aitch-bone*. The words are synonymous, but are quite distinct in origin. It is a matter of common knowledge that an older form of *aitch-bone* was *nache-bone*, a form still existing in Yorkshire (West Riding), see Carr's *Craven Glossary* (E.D.D.); cp. O.F. *nache* a buttock. But the word *ice-bone* is of Low German origin; cp. *is-been* 'das Hüftbein' (Bremen); Dutch *is-been* the haunch (Hexham); Mid. Low G. *îsbên* 'Eisbein' (Schiller-Lübben); Old Low G. *îsbên* 'clunis' (N.E.D. s.v. *Ice-bone*). The origin of *îs* is unknown.

AVERAGE. This is a word of English formation, for which no quotations are given in N.E.D. earlier than the sixteenth century. It is generally agreed that *average* is composed of the widely spread Mediterranean word *avaria* + suffix *-age*. The form of the word with the suffix *-age* is due to the analogy of other marine and mercantile terms such as 'poundage,' 'tonnage,' 'pilotage.' The word *avaria* is found in the maritime codes, ordinances and records of Mediterranean commerce as early as the thirteenth century. What was the original meaning of this Mediterranean word? S.D. says, 'Origin unknown,' and agrees with N.E.D. in denying any connexion of *avaria* with the Arabic word *'awar* meaning 'loss, damage.' N.E.D. says that 'the word *'awar* is merely a modern Arabic translation and adaptation of the western maritime term in its latest sense.' I think it can be shown that the original meaning of the Mediterranean word *avaria* was damage or loss, identical therefore with the meaning of the Arabic *'awar*.

This is certainly the usual meaning of *avaria* in the Romanic languages. Compare Ital. *avaria* 'a sea-phrase, viz. a consumption or distribution of the *loss* made, when goods are cast away on purpose in a storm to save the vessel' (Florio); Port. *avaria* 'damage to a vessel or cargo'; Fr. *avarie* 'dommage arrivé à un vaisseau ou aux marchandises dont il est chargé depuis le départ jusqu'au retour' (*Dict. de l'Académie*, 1786).

Dozy has no doubt whatever about the derivation of *avaria*: 'il est très certainement d'origine arabe.' He derives the word from Arab. *'awar* loss, damage, and says (p. 217):

> Il ne faut pas croire que *'awâr*, pris en ce sens, est un néologisme ; il appartient au contraire à la langue arabe classique, dans laquelle on dit 'une marchandise qui a un défaut (*'awâr*).' Les marchands italiens, par suite des relations fréquentes qu'ils avaient avec les Arabes, ont adopté le mot *'awâr*, qui était fort en usage, dans le commerce ; ce qui le prouve, c'est que les passages que Ducange donne sous *'Avaria'* sont empruntés à des documents génois et pisans...—La transcription *avaria* est bonne ; *ia* est la terminaison italienne. On trouve cette forme dans un document catalan de 1258 (apud Capmany).

All the uses of *avaria* and its derivative forms may be deduced from the primary meaning of damage or loss. It is interesting to note that in mod. Provençal *auvâri* is still in use for 'harm, damage' (see Mistral's transl. of Genesis, 42. 4).

Finally, it may be noted that the radical meaning of *loss* is common Semitic, and may be traced in the Hebrew root *'âwar*, which is found in the special sense of *loss* of eyesight, blindness.

BOTHER. S.D. remarks that this word first occurs in English literature in the writings of Irishmen. This fact would suggest that we

must look to Ireland for an etymology. The 'bother' which occurs in Swift and Sheridan may be simply the Irish word *bodhradh* as written and pronounced by Englishmen. This word with its many relations is one of the commonest in the Irish language. In Dinneen's *Dict.* (1904) *bodhradh* is rendered 'deafness, stunning, confusion.' A common expression among the Irish is *bodhar leat,* that is, 'confusion attend you, *bother* you.' Also, *ná bí am' bhodhradh* 'don't bother me.' *Bodhradh* is a derivative of *bodhar* 'deaf,' also, 'bothered, confused, annoyed.' *Bodhar* has cognates with the primary meaning of 'deaf' in the other Celtic languages. Wel. *byddar*, O. Corn. *bodhar*, Bret. *bouzar.* Compare Skr. *badhira* deaf. Joyce, in his *English in Ireland* (1910), p. 221, says, 'In its primary sense of to deafen *bodhram* is used in the oldest Irish documents: thus in the Book of Leinster we have: *Ro bodrais* sind, 'you have made us deaf (i.e., have *bothered* us) [talking about your son].' In E.D.D. the verb 'to bother' is rendered 'to deafen, to stun, to perplex with noisy chatter; to confuse.'

It must be owned that there is one difficulty in connecting our word 'bother' with the Irish *bodhar*—namely, in the retention of the inter-vocal dental in the English pronunciation of the word. It may be urged that there is no analogy for the Irish aspirated consonant being so treated in Irish words introduced into an Anglo-Irish dialect. But the history of the word 'bother' and its sense-development seem to me to make out a good case for the proposed etymology.

Caprice. 'A sudden change or turn of mind without apparent or adequate motive; a desire or opinion arbitrarily or fantastically formed; a freak, whim, mere fancy' (N.E.D.). The word was adopted from the French after the Restoration, 1660. It is a French form of the Ital. *capriccio* used precisely in the same sense as the English word. The word has been generally connected by etymologists with some Italian word for goat—*capro* a buck-goat or *caprio* a kid, as if it originally meant the skip or frisk of a goat or kid. In S.D. we are told 'this is not quite sure.' Neither Diez nor Skeat makes any attempt at explaining the formation of the word. *Capriccio* is a genuine Italian word, formed on Italian soil. How is the suffix *-iccio* to be accounted for? *Iccio* is only an adjectival suffix qualifying adjectives, as for example, *verdiccio* greenish from *verde* green. Has anyone ever heard of it as a substantival suffix appearing in words derived from substantives? N.E.D. suggests a Latin type *capriceus* (sic): I suppose *capricius* is intended. But Lat. *-icius* is an adjectival suffix, cp. *facticius,* Ital. *fatticcio* artificial. There is no evidence for an Italian adj. *capriccio.*

The derivation of this Italian word has been missed because etymologists in endeavouring to explain the word have considered only its modern meaning. It is quite certain that the primary meaning of *capriccio* was not a sudden freak or whim; the word was originally used in the sense of a sudden fear, a horror making the hair to stand on end 'like quills upon the fretful porcupine'—'quel tremore che fa *arricciare* i capelli o per freddo o per orrore di checchessia' (Fanfani); '*Capriccio* a sudden fear apprehended making one's hair to stand on end' (Florio). With *capriccio* in this sense we may compare Florio's definition of *arricciare* 'for a man's hair to bristle and stand on end through sudden fear.' Florio expressly connects this verb *arricciare* with *capriccio*; he has the entry '*Arricciacapo* as *Capriccio*,' evidently taking *capriccio* to be equivalent with *capo* + *riccio*. How can *riccio* be explained? It is a verbal subst. from *ricciare* to bristle (Florio). Thus *capriccio* means literally 'the bristling of the head.' The verb *arricciare* is a derivative of the Ital. *riccio* hedgehog, Lat. *ericius*. In all the Romanic languages the name for this curious effect of sudden emotion is connected with the word for the hedgehog. From the Lat. *ericius* hedgehog was formed the Romanic derivative *ericionem*, whence O.F. *eriçon* (mod. *hérisson*, cp. E. *urchin*). With *hérisson* cp. *hérisser* 'dresser les cheveux.' So Prov. *erisso* (*erissar*); Span. *erizo* (*erizar*), Port. *ouriço* (*ouriçar*). From *urchin* the ordinary dialect word for the hedgehog in the north of England we have in north Yorkshire the verb 'to *urchin*'; a man will say, 'It made me *urchin*,' meaning, 'It made my hair stand on end, it made my flesh creep.' Who would have thought that 'urchin,' our uncomplimentary word for a little boy, can be etymologically connected with the word 'caprice,' the two words being bound to one another by a common origin from the Latin word for a hedgehog?

The semantology of the Ital. *capriccio* may be illustrated from that of the Lat. *horror*. This word is connected with *horrere* to dread, lit. to bristle, with reference to the bristling of the hair through terror. Compare Skt. root *hṛṣ* (of the hair) to bristle by reason of fright or pleasure, hence, to be excited with pleasure or fear; cognate with Gr. χήρ hedgehog, identical with Old Lat. *hēr*, of which Lat. *ericius* is a derivative form. So then the Ital. *capriccio* is etymologically connected with Lat. *horror*—*riccio* and *horror* being derived ultimately from an Indo-Germanic root *GHERS* to bristle, to be rough.

Cozen. 'To trick, to cheat, to defraud' (so Johnson). S.D. considers this word to be a variant of the verb 'to *cousin*,' 'to call cousin,' 'to claim kindred with,' and compares it with Fr. *cousiner* 'appeler quelqu'un

cousin; il se dit aussi dans le style familier des petits Gentilshommes de campagne qui vont visiter les autres plus riches, pour vivre quelque temps chez eux' (*Dict. de l'Académie*, 1786). But is there any necessary connexion between sponging and cheating? I think that Prof. Weekley has made out a good case for equating our word *cozen* with the Ital. *cozzonare* 'to play the Horse-courser; by met.: to play the crafty knave, to have perfect skill in all *Cozenages*' (Florio). For ample evidence in support of this equation the reader is referred to Professor Weekley's Paper on Anglo-French Etymologies in *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1909), p. 12.

ESPLANADE. S.D. tells us that the Fr. *esplanade* is 'formed in imitation of Ital. *spianata* an esplanade.' Imitation of an Italian word is an unnecessary hypothesis. *Esplanade* is a genuine native formation, of Provençal origin, cp. Prov. *esplanada*, deriv. of *esplanar* to level, to make plain; also, to explain. Compare Sp. *esplanada* 'properly the Glacis of the Counter-scarp in Fortification; the empty space between the Glacis of a Citadel and the first Houses of a Town' (Stevens).

FULL. 'To full cloth.' S.D. derives this word (M.E. *fullen*) directly from O.F. *fuler* (mod. F. *fouler*), the *u* representing Romanic close *o*. But then we should expect *fowl* not *full* in modern English. Certainly O.F. *fuler* (Rom. *fōlare*) could not have been represented by *fullen* in Middle English. It may be safely assumed that our verb 'full' represents an O.E. *fullian*, which may be inferred from O.E. *fullere* (in Mark 9. 3). It is probable that O.E. *fullere* a fuller, and O.F. *fuler* (to full), are independent derivatives of a Late Latin *fullare* to full cloth, cognate with Lat. *fullo* a fuller.

GAVELKIND. S.D. connects O.E. *gafol* with *gifan* (to give) and makes it the origin of the Low Latin *gabulum*. I think there can be no doubt that the Latin *gabulum* and the O.E. *gafol* are identical, but it is impossible to accept the view that *gafol* is a genuine Teutonic word, or that *gabulum* can be derived from an English source. It seems to me that there are good reasons for holding that Lat. *gabulum* is of Arabic origin, and that O.E. *gafol* directly represents the Latin form *gabulum*. The two words are identical in meaning: they both mean 'tax, tribute'; certainly *gafol* never meant a gift, as the etymology of S.D. would seem to imply. Again, *gafol* is precisely the form we should expect *gabulum* to assume in Old English, if borrowed at an early date. If one studies the article *Gablum* (*gabulum*) in Ducange, it will be seen how widely

spread the word was in the sense of 'census, tributum, reditus' throughout Europe and especially on the shores of the Mediterranean, and how impossible it is to suppose that a word of such universal currency can have its origin in an isolated Teutonic form, only to be found in our little island. Such an hypothesis has only to be examined in the light of Ducange's account of *gabulum* to be summarily rejected.

What is the origin of *gabulum*? I see no reason for not accepting Dozy's view that it is a Latinization of the Arabic word *qabâla* which means a tax or tribute, esp. a tax on land. Dozy puts the matter very clearly. He says:

> Le mot anglo-saxon présente, quant à la forme, de grandes difficultés, et il serait assez étrange que les peuples du midi eussent emprunté le nom d'un impôt aux Anglais, avec lesquels ils avaient bien peu de rapports, tandis qu'ils en avaient beaucoup avec les Arabes. Les habitants de l'Italie méridionale vivaient même sous la domination de ces derniers, et c'était à eux qu'ils payaient les tributs. *Glossaire*, pp. 74, 75.

It should be noted that in Italy the Arabic word was also written *caballa* and *cabella*. The initial *g* in *gabulum* need create no difficulty, as the Arab. *qof* is sometimes represented by *g* in the Romanic languages[1].

Arab. *qabâla* is from the √ *qabal* to receive, take from, hence the verb *qabil*, cp. Heb. *qābal* with the same meaning, from which is derived the Rabbinical word for oral tradition which is written in English *cabbala*.

HUGGER-MUGGER. 'Secrecy'; *in hugger-mugger* 'clandestinely.' S.D. considers the first element of this reduplicated word to be unmeaning, and connects the second element with the word *muck*. This is not very satisfactory. It is suggested by Dr Joyce in *English as we speak it in Ireland* (1909), p. 243, that the Anglo-Irish word *cugger-mugger* may be an older form of *hugger-mugger*, both the words connoting secrecy. *Cugger-mugger* means whispering, gossiping in a low voice. Compare the Irish word *cogar* which means primarily a whisper. *Cogar* has many derivatives with the sense of whispering, secret confabulation, clandestine plotting, conspiring; see Dinneen's Irish Dictionary...The Middle-Irish form of the word is *coccur* (Leabhar Breac). The form *hugger-* (with initial *h*, may be explained as due to an aspirated *c*. This explanation of an initial *h* may also account for another *hugger* (also *hogger*), the name in some parts of Scotland for a coarse stocking (see E.D.D.). This word (as E.D.D. and N.E.D. suggest) may be

[1] See Engelmann's note on the representation of initial *qof* in Dozy's *Glossaire* (ed. 2), p. 15. It is there said, 'au Maroc le ق (qof) se prononce constamment *g*, Dombay, p. 5.'

connected with the synonymous M.E. *cocker* a casing for the leg, a word still in use in the north for coarse stockings without feet. This *cocker* is identical with O.E. *cocer* a quiver. The etymology of this *cocer* is unknown. It is probably not of Teutonic origin. It may be noted that *κούκουρον* (*κούρκουρον* in Theophanes) occurs in Greek authors as early as the ninth century.

IMBRUE. S.D. gives 'to moisten' as the meaning of *imbrue*, and of the French equivalent *embruer*, and holds that *embruer* is a variant of O.F. *embreuver* to moisten, and that the -breuver of *embreuver* represents a causal verb **biberare* from Lat. *bibere* to drink. Grave objections can be brought against this explanation of the word *imbrue* (Fr. *embruer*) from considerations of form and meaning. If we examine the quotations given under 'imbrue' in N.E.D. or in Johnson's Dictionary we cannot help seeing that the primary, the central meaning of *imbrue* is not to moisten, drench, but to stain, soil, defile. The word is used especially of hands defiled by blood. N.E.D. gives a separate section to the meaning 'to stain, dye one's hand, sword, etc. *in* or *with* blood, slaughter, etc.,' illustrated by many quotations. As to form, I think that the *u* both in *imbrue* and in Fr. *embruer* must point to a Latin *ū*. In mod. Provençal there is a verb *embruti*, which renders 'maculare' of the Vulgate, Gen. 49. 4 (Mistral's version). May not this word be equated with *imbrue*? Compare Ital. '*bruttare* to foul, to pollute, to defile, to sully' (Florio). In northern dialects Latin *tt* whence Romanic simplified intervocal *t* is sometimes lost, as in the case of *Matt(h)aeum*, Fr. *Mathieu*, Ang.-Nor. *Maheu* (in *Chanson de Roland*), cp. the English surname *Mayhew*.

MARCHPANE. This is a word of obscure origin. Many explanations have been suggested by etymologists, but no explanation has been offered, as far as I am aware, that has been made out clearly enough to command the general approval of scholars. S.D. takes the Ital. *marcia-pane* as the original form, and says, 'The origin of *marcia* is unknown; it probably represents a name such as Lat. *Martia*; *pane* is Lat. *panem* bread.' Now, the name for this popular kind of confectionery is known in various forms all over Europe. The forms may be divided into two groups—(*α*) the *r*- group and (*β*) the non-*r*- group: (*α*) Ital. *marzapane*, also *marciapane* (Florio); Fr. *marcepain* (in sixteenth century, see N.E.D.); Ger. *martzepan* (1521); Du. *marcepain* (1486); Da. *marsipan*; E. *marchpane*; (*β*) Sp. *mazapan*; Port. *maçapão*; Fr. *massepain*; Prov. *massapan*. An ingenious attempt to explain this difficult word has been made by Kluyver in *Zeitschr. f. deutsche Wortforschung*, July 1904.

I will give the main points of Kluyver's argument. What seems to be the same word as the word we are discussing occurs in various Romanic forms in the sense of a small box: *Massapanum* (Fr. *massepan*), 'Arcula,' a Massilian word, also *Maczapanum* (Dauphiné); see Ducange; Neap. *marzapane* a little box of wood or paste-board; Prov. *massapan* (O. Prov. *masapan*) 'boîte ou petite caisse faite de bois léger dans laquelle on met ordinairement ou des confitures ou des choses précieuses' (Honnorat). Kluyver says that the preparation of sugar and almonds (which we call 'marchpane') was of Oriental origin, and was sold in the Levant in such boxes, hence the Italian name for the sweetmeat (*marzapane*). Pegolotti says that in Famagosta, Cyprus, the sweetmeat *marzapane* was sold in little wooden boxes called *marzapani*[1].

But what is the etymology of this name for a little box, *marzapane* (*massapanum*)? Kluyver connects the word with the name of a Levantine coin current in the twelfth century, which is found in the Ital. form *marzapane* as a trade word in Syria[2]. This is the same word as *matapanus* the name of a Venetian coin, on which word Ducange gives the following account taken from a Chronicle (ann. 1193): 'Subsequenter Dux [Andreas Dandulus] argenteam monetam, vulgariter dictam, *Grossi Venetiani* vel *Matapani*, cum imagine Jesu Christi in throno...primo fieri decrevit.'

Kluyver identifies this word with the Arab. *mauthabân* (or *mausabân*) which means one who sits, one who stays always at home, used of a king who undertakes nothing; and conjectures that it may have been used by the Saracens as a descriptive name for the coin bearing this image.

A. L. Mayhew.

Oxford.

[1] For the development of meaning compare the history of the word *junket* meaning (1) a rush-basket, (2) a cream-cheese offered for sale in a rush-basket (N.E.D.).

[2] Compare the history of the word *gazette*, It. *gazzetta* 'a kind of small coin in Venice' (Florio), also the name of a newspaper published in Venice, either because the paper cost a *gazzetta* or because this was the sum paid for the privilege of reading it (N.E.D.).

(To be concluded.)

THE CENTENARY OF THE COMPLETION OF CARY'S 'DANTE.'

On May 8, 1812, Cary made the following entry in his *Journal*:— 'Finished my translation of Dante's *Commedia*—begun the 16th of Jan. 1797.' The translation of the *Inferno* had been published in two volumes in 1805–6, accompanied by the Italian text, then for the first time printed in England. This first instalment, greatly to Cary's mortification, was received with 'coldness and indifference.' But in spite of the discouragement he persevered with his task, and six years later he was able to record its completion as above.

The complete translation was not published for another two years, the delay being due in part to Cary's failure to find a publisher. Finally he decided to publish at his own expense, and in January 1814 the work appeared in three diminutive volumes (small enough to fit conveniently into 'the aptest corner' of Keats' knapsack on a walking tour), at what was then regarded as the modest price of twelve shillings, in boards. Little notice was taken of the book by reviewers or public until four years after its publication, when it suddenly leaped into fame in consequence of an appreciative mention by Coleridge in a lecture on Dante delivered in London in February 1818. Coleridge's praise was promptly echoed in an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, with the result that nearly a thousand unsold copies of the first edition were at once disposed of, and a demand was made for a new edition. Within a few months Cary received from the booksellers more than £200 as profits from a venture which he had written off as a dead failure; while at the same time his reputation in the world of letters was established beyond question as the translator of Dante.

No record, unfortunately, has been preserved of the remarks by Coleridge in his lecture which so profoundly affected the fortunes of Cary's translation. Rogers, who was present at the lecture, merely recalls that Coleridge 'spoke of Cary's *Dante* in high terms of praise';

while Crabb Robinson, who entered notes of the lecture in his *Diary*, makes no reference to the mention of Cary. Coleridge's estimate of the work, however, may be gathered from other sources. In the *Friend* he consoles himself for the fact that his own translation of *Wallenstein* 'has long ago been used up, as "winding-sheets for pilchards,"' with the reflection that 'a much better and very far more valuable work, the Rev. Mr Cary's incomparable translation of Dante had very nearly met with the same fate'; and in a correspondence with Cary himself, whom he styles 'Dante's English Duplicate and Re-incarnation,' he says:

'In the peculiar character of the Blank Verse, your translation of Dante has transcended what I should have thought possible without the Terza Rima. In itself, the metre is, compared with any English poem of one quarter the length, the most varied and harmonious to my ear of any since Milton, and yet the effect is so Dantesque that to those who should compare it only with other English poems, it would, I doubt not, have the same effect as the Terza Rima has compared with other Italian metres.... Of the diction, I can only say that it is Dantesque even in that in which the Florentine must be preferred to our English giant—namely that it is not only pure *language*, but pure *English*.'

Still more eloquent testimony to Coleridge's high appreciation of Cary's performance is afforded by the marginal annotations in pen and pencil in his own copy of the second edition (1819) of the translation, which is preserved in the British Museum.

'Those only who see the difficulty of the original,' he writes on one passage, 'can do justice to Mr Cary's Translation—which may now and then not be Dante's *Words*, but always, always, *Dante*.'

'Admirably translated!' he notes in another place. 'O how few will appreciate its value! Genius is not alone sufficient—it must be present, indeed, in the Translator, in order to supply a *negative* Test by its sympathy; to *feel* that it *has* been well done. But it is *Taste, Scholarship, Discipline*, TACT, that must do it.'

In the preface to his second edition (published in July 1819, in three handsome 8vo volumes at 36/-) Cary gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to Coleridge, but for whose 'prompt and strenuous exertions in recommending the book to public notice' the new edition would never have come into existence. The popularity of the work was well maintained during Cary's lifetime. A third edition (in 3 vols. 12mo, at 18/-) was published in 1831; and a fourth (in a single volume 12mo, at 10/6; and, to compete with a pirated American edition, 8vo in double columns, at 6/-, which was sold out within a fortnight) in 1844,

the year of his death; since which date innumerable cheap reprints have been issued both here and in America.

There have been only two serious rivals to Cary's translation, namely those of Wright and Longfellow. Wright's translation, in bastard *terza rima*, was first published in three instalments, in 1833–36–40. It went through several editions, and had the advantage of being the translation quoted in preference to Cary by the late Dean Church in his famous essay on Dante (1850); and it is still occasionally reprinted. But in spite of its attractive metre and scholarly qualities it has not succeeded in dethroning Cary. Longfellow's version, in literal line for line blank verse, the first complete American translation, was first published (in Boston and London) in 1867. It at once achieved a wide popularity both in this country and in America, and has many times been reprinted. With Americans it may perhaps by now have displaced Cary, but to an Englishman Cary still, after a hundred years, remains the translation which, as Dr Garnett expressed it, occurs first to the mind on the mention of Dante.

To the present generation, which has something like thirty versions of the *Commedia* to choose from, in every variety of metre, the enthusiasm of Coleridge and his contemporaries for Cary's translation may seem difficult to account for. But if any one who shares this opinion will place himself at Coleridge's standpoint, and acquaint himself with the methods of Dante translation in vogue before Cary, he will cease to be surprised. Let him compare Cary with some of his immediate predecessors, with Charles Rogers, for instance, of whose *Inferno* (1782) the following are fair samples:

> Above the bank, which served to conceal
> Like breeches, all the parts below the waist.
>
> I saw
> Two frozen in one hole; the head of one,
> Like to a hat, the other's covered o'er:
> And, greedily as bread in hunger's eat,
> In th' under's skull the upper fix'd his teeth.

Or with Boyd (1785), who speaks of Dante's Virgil as 'him who sung Eliza's woes'; and by way of 'dilating the scanty expressions' of his author, adds 'characteristic imagery' of his own, so as to expand, for example, half a line of Dante, consisting of two names, into a stanza of six lines. Or with Jennings (1794), who recast the Ugolino episode into 'one consistent *Ensemble*,' and omitted from his translation of the 'little Novel of Francesca' thirty-five lines as being 'injurious to the Poem,' besides suppressing all reference to the tail of Minos in the fifth

canto, 'being rather shocked to think that so elegant a Poet should have so wantonly given him One, and of such enormous Length as to go many Times round him.' Or with Wharton (1802), who, while proclaiming his fidelity to the original, does not scruple to father upon Dante this tasteless tag at the end of the Ugolino:—

> The Spectre ceas'd: and kindling with disdain
> Snatch'd the torn scalp with eager fangs again.
> Still as he gnaws, the flesh, the vessels grow:
> Still as he quaffs the purple currents flow:
> Still o'er th' eternal wound the fibres spread:
> Such is their mutual doom: and such th' atonement paid.

To turn from such travesties as these to Cary's 'polar-star' version, as Lamb called it, is to emerge as it were from the dark ages of Dante translation. Himself a poet and a scholar, Cary was the first who approached Dante with the reverence due to a great poet and a great classic, and who entered on his task with the resolve to follow faithfully 'dietro alle poste delle care piante' of his master. As his *Journal* testifies, Cary did not grudge to bestow upon the *Commedia* the labour and love, 'il lungo studio e il grande amore,' which other scholars had been accustomed to reserve for the masterpieces of ancient literature; and he thus, after years of patient toil, qualified himself to produce the translation which once and for all made Dante a possession of the English-speaking world, and won for the translator himself a grave among the illustrious dead in Westminster Abbey.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

THE SOURCES OF HEBBEL'S 'AGNES BERNAUER.'

III[1].

Hebbel's Indebtedness to Törring's 'Agnes Bernauerinn.'

It is a significant fact that no fewer than five of Hebbel's dramas owe their origin to his dissatisfaction with an already existing work on the same subject. Although Hebbel had known the Volksbuch of *Genoveva* from his boyhood[2], he only definitely commenced work on his drama when disappointed at not finding the story adequately treated by Maler Müller and Tieck. The representation of Massinger's *Ludovico*[3] (a version of the Herod-Marianne story of Josephus) and Raupach's *Nibelungen Hort*[4] at the Hofburgtheater incited Hebbel to write his *Herodes und Marianne* and *Nibelungen* trilogy. Schiller's *Demetrius* called forth Hebbel's last drama, and similarly *Agnes Bernauer* owes its existence to Graf Törring's *Agnes Bernauerinn, ein vaterländisches Trauerspiel.* Hebbel has himself stated how important a *rôle* Törring's drama played in the genesis of his own. 'Ich kannte dies Werk, ich achtete es auch als eine sehr gelungene Ausbeutung der historischen Anecdote, konnte mich aber mit der Auffassung so wenig befreunden, dass gerade sie mich vorzugsweise mit zu meiner Arbeit antrieb[5]'; in other words it was Törring's treatment of the problem, which drew Hebbel's attention to its suitability for giving voice to several of his favourite ideas.

Before considering Hebbel's actual indebtedness to his predecessor, it may be advisable to recapitulate briefly the most important points

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, p. 322.

[2] Cf. B. Golz, *Die Pfalzgräfin Genoveva in der deutschen Dichtung*, Leipzig, 1897, p. 107.

[3] Criticism of *Ludovico*, 1848. (Hebbel's *Sämmtliche Werke* herausgegeben von R. M. Werner, XI, 247.) This edition of Hebbel's works is referred to in the following pages as *S. W.*; the *Tagebücher* and *Briefwechsel* in the same edition as *Tb.* and *Bw.* respectively.

[4] Introduction to *Die Nibelungen* (*S. W.*, IV, 5).

[5] Letter of Aug. 20, 1853 (*B. W.*, V, 123).

relating to Törring's play[1]. Published in 1780 it obtained an instantaneous success at its first representation at Mannheim in 1781, was classed by contemporary critics as equal if not superior to Goethe's *Götz*, and called forth many imitations. The reasons for this success are not far to seek: the play united the sentimentality of the eighteenth century with the patriotism of *Götz*, and was above all rooted in the 'Sturm und Drang.' The subject itself, the love of a nobleman for a girl of low degree, was a favourite one with the dramatists of the period, and the technique is also that of the 'Sturm und Drang.' But in one important point Törring is not a 'Stürmer und Dränger'; as a patriotic statesman, he saw the necessity of the individual submitting to the welfare of the State, and has given definite expression to his views. Brahm (p. 47) has shown that in the first two acts the individualistic standpoint is predominant, that Törring's sympathy is entirely on the side of the lovers, and that Ernst is depicted as an embittered father and unscrupulous autocrat. But when the poet reaches the middle of Act III, an entire change seems to have come over his views[2]; with the entry of Gundelfing and still more with that of Kaspar der Thorringer, who voices the opinions of his descendant, prominence is given to duty and patriotism; here for the first time we hear that Albrecht has a higher duty than that towards Agnes. This change of motive necessitated, above all, an alteration in the character of Ernst; he could no longer be an unscrupulous tyrant, he must desire the good of his country above all else and unwillingly sacrifice Agnes for the good of Bavaria. But Törring does not push this theory to its logical conclusion and make Ernst entirely responsible for the murder. He avoided the difficulty involved in the reconciliation of father and son (if the former alone is guilty) by shifting the blame on to the Vicedom and robbing the character of Ernst of all unity. The duke is at one time a passionate tyrant, at another a weak tool in the hands of his ministers, and finally an enlightened monarch actuated by the same motives as Hebbel's Ernst.

Thus it is evident that Hebbel found one of the main ideas of his drama, namely the subordination of the individual to the welfare of the State, treated, although inadequately, by his predecessor, and it was just this inadequate treatment which incited Hebbel to write a drama in which the same idea should be carried through consistently.

[1] Cf. O. Brahm, *Das deutsche Ritterdrama des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts.* (*Quellen und Forschungen*, 40.) Strassburg, 1880.

[2] Cf. Brahm, p. 46, for an hypothesis to account for this seeming inconsistency in Törring's drama.

As in the older play, Albrecht and Agnes represent the individualistic standpoint but, unlike Törring, Hebbel has made Ernst the consistent representative of the State, to which all individual interests must be sacrificed. Ernst is entirely responsible for the murder, and Hebbel does not need to shift the blame on to a stage villain[1], for he is quite prepared to carry his convictions to the bitter end, even to the much criticised reconciliation scene at the close of Act v. To sum up. Hebbel took over the main idea underlying Törring's drama, but found it necessary to make considerable alterations in the plot and characters, Otto Ludwig on the other hand proceeded in exactly the opposite way. Unlike Hebbel he fully approved of Törring's technique[2], and followed him in all his Agnes Bernauer dramas as regards intrigue and artificiality of plot, but was very little, if at all, influenced by Törring's emphasis of the importance of the State.

With regard to sources, Törring has stated in the introduction to his play that he followed Oeffele's *Scriptores rerum boicarum*; it is also extremely probable that he consulted Falckenstein's history, and as Hebbel also used that work, some of the agreements between Törring and Hebbel may be traced to a common source.

Turning now to a more detailed comparison of the two dramas, we are struck by the fact that there is the greatest divergence in the commencement. Hebbel devotes two whole acts to the love story[3], while Törring's play opens after the marriage has already taken place. Hebbel saw in this omission of the 'Vorgeschichte' an admission on Törring's part of his inability to treat the subject adequately. 'Seine Auffassung des Gegenstandes...steht im vollkommenen Einklang mit den Mitteln, die er aufzubieten hatte. Darum stellt er das Liebes-Verhältniss, für das ihm die Farben fehlten, nebst dem Abschluss in der Heirath, gleich in der ersten Scene fertig hin[4].' We notice exactly the same difference in Hebbel's and Schiller's treatment of the Demetrius theme. Here again Hebbel traces the origin of the relationship between hero and heroine and the development of their characters,

[1] It may be noted here that we find the trace of a villain, and perhaps of a former and more artificial plot, in Agnes's denunciation of Emeran Nusperger zu Kalmperg in Act v, sc. 3, of Hebbel's drama. It is a pity Hebbel has not cleared up this episode, for Nusperger is one of the three judges who has condemned Agnes, and on whose integrity Ernst lays so much weight. Cf. Hebbel's *Ausgewählte Werke*, herausgegeben von R. Specht (*Cottasche Bibliothek*), III, 193.

[2] Ludwig's *Nachlassschriften*, herausgegeben v. M. Heydrich, I, Leipzig, 1874, pp. 253 f.

[3] In his letter of Aug. 17, 1853, Gutzkow blames Hebbel's procedure: 'dramatisch sind die beiden ersten Acte derselben Sache zu viel' (Hebbel's *Briefwechsel*, herausgegeben von Bamberg, II, 153).

[4] Letter of Jan. 26, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 346).

and blames Schiller for pursuing an opposite course. 'Er [Schiller] setzt hier, wie immer, Alles voraus und giebt sich nie damit ab, die Wurzeln der Menschen und der Dinge bloss zu legen; so ist Marina vom ersten Moment an die eingefleischte Herrschsucht[1].' Thus Hebbel's divergence from Törring in this respect is based on one of the fundamental rules of his art, 'überall soll der Dichter ökonomisch sein, nur nicht in den Grundmotiven[2].'

Although Törring has not put the actual 'Vorgeschichte' on the stage, he has nevertheless given hints as to how it might have been treated in the second scene of Act I of his play, when the lovers recall their emotions at their first meeting, and Hebbel has followed the lines indicated. In his drama we also find 'die arme Bürgerstochter...in der Demuth ihres Standes, ringend mit der Tugend...ringend mit der Vernunft, dass sie's nicht wage einen Herzog zu lieben'; we also notice 'das ehrwürdig Misstrauen des alten Vaters,' who finally gives his consent and blessing. Only one or two passages in the first two acts of Hebbel's *Agnes Bernauer* are slightly reminiscent of Törring.

Act I, sc. 14. Emphasis is laid on the fact that Albrecht does not take his sword with him on leaving the inn; the passage gains in clearness on reference to Törring (Act III, sc. 3), where one of the charges brought against Albrecht at the tournament is that he walked about the streets of Augsburg without a sword.

Act II, sc. 10: 'Wenn du...dich dankbar zeigen willst, so nenne mich zum erstenmal du.' In connection with this passage it is interesting to note that in Törring's play Agnes, as is only natural considering the prejudices of the time, is much more sensible of her inferiority towards Albrecht, and throughout the play addresses him as 'Ihr,' while he calls her 'Du.' Immediately after the marriage (Act I, sc. 2) she asks whether she may call him by his Christian name, but does not dare to use the second person singular.

At the commencement of the third act of Hebbel's drama Agnes and Albrecht are married and, as is to be expected, the resemblances to Törring are greater. Of course Hebbel is bound to be more concise, as he has devoted two acts to the relationship of Albrecht and Agnes before their marriage, and practically has to get the same matter into three acts, which Törring spreads over five.

Ernst's two deliberations with Preising at the commencement of Acts III and IV are slightly reminiscent of Törring, inasmuch as he,

[1] Letter of Oct. 2, 1858 (*Bw.*, VI, 204).
[2] Quoted by Bamberg in his edition of Hebbel's *Werke*, VI, p. xiii.

influenced no doubt by Falckenstein's repeated references to Ernst's 'Räte,' has a liking for council-scenes. He has adopted the very clumsy expedient of closing each of the first three acts with a discussion between the duke and his counsellors; that at the close of Act II is particularly improbable and very undramatic, as all the people go out and leave Ernst and his advisers to debate in the empty 'Turnierplatz.' Hebbel is much more natural and consistent, his council scenes bear more resemblance to Goethe's than to Törring's. As in *Egmont*, the ruler twice asks the advice of a single trusted counsellor; Ernst's discussion of State affairs with Preising (Act III, sc. 6) in particular bears a marked likeness to a similar scene between Egmont and his secretary[1]. In the course of this scene we notice that Ernst in Hebbel's, no less than in Törring's play, expects implicit obedience from his son in the matter of his marriage. We might have expected that such an enlightened prince as Hebbel depicts, would at least have consulted his son before selecting a wife for him, but this is not the case: 'Wird Albrecht einverstanden sein? Darnach hab' ich wahrhaftig noch nicht gefragt, das denk' ich versteht sich von selbst' and again, 'er sagt ja, ob gern oder ungern—das kümmert mich nicht' (Act III, sc. 6). As regards the whole question of Albrecht's second marriage, Törring seems to have been the first to mention Anna von Braunschweig (whom the historical Albrecht subsequently married) during the Agnes Bernauer episode; in his drama Anna is proposed to Albrecht as a suitable wife and he refuses to marry her. In one of Törring's sources, namely Oeffele[2], the following statement occurs: 'differebat ducere uxorem legitimam'; on the strength of this passage Törring introduced Anna, and has been followed by Lipowsky, who enlarged on Törring and formed the immediate source of Hebbel's treatment of the incident[3].

Act III, sc. 10: Preising summons Albrecht to the tournament and tries to persuade him to submit to the wishes of his father, renounce Agnes and marry Anna. This scene is modelled on two similar scenes in Törring's drama, namely Act I, sc. 5, in which Preising summons Albrecht to the tournament, and Act III, sc. 5 and 6, in which Gundelfing and Kaspar der Thorringer both remind Albrecht of his duties towards his country. A few resemblances may be noted, as they serve to show that Törring's play was in Hebbel's mind when

[1] *Egmont*, Act II, sc. 2.
[2] Quoted by F. J. Lipowsky, *Agnes Bernauerinn*, Munich, 1800, p. 93.
[3] Cf. *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, 311.

writing. Both scenes (Act III, sc. 10, of Hebbel, and Act I, sc. 5, of Törring) open with a reference to a 'fröhliche Botschaft,' in both Albrecht is surprised at the short notice given of the tournament—'Das kommt ja rascher zu Stande als eine Bauernschlägerei' (Hebbel); 'Wann ist das Turnier? Morgen fängt's an. Und heute beruft man mich, ist das Rittersitte? (Törring)—but nevertheless declares his willingness to take part: 'Ich will um eine Erbsenschote turnieren' (Hebbel); 'Ihr sollt mich kämpfen sehen um nichts' (Törring); in both dramas Albrecht has to depart on the same day, takes a hasty farewell of his wife, and leaves one of his friends to protect her during his absence.

Act III, sc. 13: It has already been shown[1] that Törring first invented the tournament scene, that Lipowsky enlarged on it and was closely followed by Hebbel as far as the general structure is concerned. But in a few minor details Hebbel has been immediately influenced by Törring. The stage directions in both plays are very much alike, thus for example Albrecht attacks one of the officials and is struck by Ernst.

Hebbel.	*Törring.*
Albrecht zieht und dringt auf den Marschall ein...Ernst schlägt ihm mit der Faust aufs Schwert.	Albrecht zieht und schlägt den Vicedom mit dem Rücken des Schwertes... Ernst schlägt. Albrecht ebenso.

Towards the close of the scene there are several verbal agreements, especially when Albrecht calls on the people for help.

Hebbel.	*Törring.*
(*Albrecht*) Otto mein Ahnherr für Treu.	
(*Ernst*) Das Turnier ist aus.	(*Albrecht*) Das Turnier ist aus....
(*Albrecht*) Nein, es beginnt	Auf meine Bayern, wer Ottens
...Bürger und Bauern heran.	Enkel liebt !...folge mir.
	(Menge Ritter und Volk umstehen Albrechten.)

Ernst's declaration of Adolf as his successor is absolutely unhistorical, and is not to be found in any of Hebbel's sources. Törring's Act I, sc. 7, may be compared: 'so soll Bayern wissen, dass Ernst keinen Sohn mehr hat.' Taken as a whole, Hebbel's tournament scene contrasts most favourably with that of his predecessor; it is remarkable for its brevity, the steps follow upon one another logically, and the points borrowed from Törring and Lipowsky are used to the greatest advantage. Albrecht is forced to declare his marriage, and is at once disinherited. Törring's scene is long and rambling in comparison, and

[1] *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, 311 f.

as Albrecht is dishonoured whether he has married Agnes or not, he has no particular reason for announcing his marriage.

In the latter part of the fourth act and the whole of the fifth the similarity of construction between the two plays is very marked. This will be clear from the following tabulation:

Hebbel.	*Törring.*
Act IV, sc. 7.	Act IV, sc. 5—8.
Farewell of Albrecht and Agnes.	Farewell of Albrecht and Agnes.
Graf Törring left for her protection.	Zenger left for her protection.
Sc. 10. Interview of Agnes and Theobald.	Sc. 8. Tuchsenhauser tries to persuade Agnes to renounce Albrecht; she obstinately refuses (cp. Hebbel, Act V, sc. 2).
Sc. 11—12. Castle taken by treachery; fighting on stage; Törring falls; Agnes taken prisoner.	Sc. 9—11. Castle taken by treachery; fighting on stage; Zenger falls; Agnes taken prisoner.
Act V.	Act V.
	Sc. 1. Interview of the Vicedom with Tuchsenhauer.
Sc. 1. Agnes' monologue in prison.	Sc. 2. Agnes' monologue in prison.
Sc. 2. Preising tries to persuade Agnes to renounce Albrecht, but she obstinately refuses. (Cp. Törring, Act IV, sc. 8.)	
	Sc. 3, 4. Trial of Agnes.
Sc. 4—7. Ernst hears of the murder; description of the deed.	Sc. 5. Albrecht hears of Agnes' imprisonment.
	Sc. 6. Agnes drowned on the stage.
Sc. 8—10. Albrecht swears revenge, but is ultimately reconciled to his father, who reminds him of his duty to Bavaria.	Sc. 8. Albrecht swears revenge, but is ultimately reconciled to his father, who reminds him of his duty to Bavaria.
Embassy from the Emperor. Abdication of Ernst.	
Ernst decrees a perpetual mass at Agnes' tomb, and refers to her as 'das reinste Opfer der Notwendigheit.'	Ernst decrees a perpetual mass at Agnes' tomb, and refers to her as 'Schlachtopfer des Staats.'

Only a few points call for notice: (1) In Törring's drama the attempt to persuade Agnes to renounce her husband is made before she is in the power of her enemies, while with Hebbel the same attempt is made immediately before the murder; in both dramas Agnes's refusal leads up to the catastrophe, in the one case (Törring) to the storming of the castle, in the other to the execution. The scenes, as is to be expected, have several features in common; for example, both ambassadors exceed their orders: 'ich gehe vielleicht schon weiter als ich darf' (Hebbel); 'vielleicht hab' ich schon mehr gesagt, als der Würde dessen, der mich gesandt hat...anstund' (Törring).

(2) Törring has given a trial scene; in Hebbel's drama this was not necessary, as according to him Agnes had been condemned by legal experts two and a half years previously.

(3) Törring represents the actual drowning of Agnes on the stage, Hebbel is content with a description of the deed.

(4) Hebbel has followed Törring in one respect, which has been severely criticised, namely in letting the reconciliation between father and son take place immediately after the murder. With Törring this reconciliation is much more probable, inasmuch as Ernst is not alone responsible, Albrecht believes that his father would have prevented the execution if he had come in time[1].

(5) Both dukes rather meanly sacrifice their subordinates, who were only carrying out their instructions; Torring's Ernst the Vicedom and Hebbel's duke Pappenheim and Haydeck, who fall victims to Albrecht's first paroxysms of rage.

In conclusion it may be noted that there are more changes of scenery and more scenic descriptions in *Agnes Bernauer* than in Hebbel's other plays; this may be due to the influence of Törring, who, in the manner of the 'Sturm und Drang,' had no scruples as to changing the scene as often as it suited him, and delighted in descriptions. It should, however, be also borne in mind that Hebbel considered that a drama on national history necessitated more scenic descriptions, as the poet could reckon on an interest of the people in their own past.

IV.

The Influence of Kleist.

Hebbel's individuality and independence of thought are so pronounced that it is difficult indeed to trace the influence of another poet in his works. We are, however, not justified in going as far as Grillparzer[2], who absolutely denied that any one, not even excepting Goethe, could have at all influenced Hebbel, for the poet has himself told us how great was the debt he owed to Schiller and Uhland in his youth and, above all, he has repeatedly acknowledged his indebtedness to Heinrich von Kleist. To give but two examples: in his student days at Munich Hebbel announced his intention of following Kleist in

[1] Törring is very inconsistent here, for if it was necessary for the good of Bavaria that Agnes should die, why did Ernst wish to prevent the deed at the last?

[2] Entry of Sept. 10, 1861 (*Tb.*, IV, 202).

that psychological method which was so peculiarly well suited to his own genius: 'Kleist ist, so weit man ein Muster haben kann, mein Muster...er zeichnet immer das Innere und das Äussere zugleich, Eins durch das Andere, und das ist das allein Rechte[1]'; and in 1855 when Heine designated him as being 'de la parenté intellectuelle de Kleist,' Hebbel willingly admitted the justice of the comparison; 'ich rechne mir die Verwandtschaft mit Kleist nur zur Ehre....Kleist hat sogar direct auf mich gewirkt, wenn auch nicht auf meine Dramen, sondern auf meine Erzählungen[2].' There seems however to be no reason for thus limiting Kleist's influence to Hebbel's novels, on the contrary it may be even possible to trace a connection between *Agnes Bernauer* and Kleist's dramatic work.

In considering the possible influence of any one drama, *Käthchen von Heilbronn* at once occurs to the mind, for this play also treats of a mediæval subject and centres in a daughter of the people.

It may further be recalled that Hebbel admitted that his ballad of *Schön Hedwig* was modelled on Kleist's heroine ('Schön Hedwig... hat dem Käthchen von Heilbronn seinen besten Putz abgeborgt[3]'), and that in 1847 he thought of taking up the 'Grundmotiv' of Kleist's drama, 'dass die Liebe, die Alles opfert, Alles gewinnt[4],' and of carrying it through consistently without the 'phantastische Räder und Federn[5],' which in his opinion detracted from the value of *Käthchen*. But Hebbel did not carry out his plan, and we have already seen that, as far as *Agnes Bernauer* is concerned, he took quite another Ritterdrama, namely that of Graf Törring, and worked out a totally different idea from that underlying *Käthchen von Heilbronn*. In his manner of treating a mediæval theme Hebbel also does not seem to have been at all influenced by Kleist. Neither the technique, in which his predecessor had closely followed the old Ritterdramen, nor the romantic *milieu* of Kleist's play, at all appealed to Hebbel. The scenes in *Käthchen* are very loosely strung together, and there are plenty of irrevelant episodes, but Kleist has succeeded in infusing the spirit of true poetry into the eighteenth century Ritterdrama. *Agnes Bernauer*, on the other hand, is admirably constructed, every episode is closely connected with the whole, although Hebbel has certainly not been able to endow his heroine with any of Käthchen's charm. Kleist has

[1] Letter of May 23, 1837 (*Bw.*, I, 203).
[2] Letter of March 19, 1855 (*Bw.*, V, 220).
[3] Letter of June 21, 1853 (*Bw.*, V, 109).
[4] Entry of August 29, 1847 (*Tb.*, III, 267).
[5] Letter of Sept. 6, 1861 (*Bw.*, VII, 69).

drawn a living figure; Käthchen is truly national, and takes her place beside Klärchen and Gretchen[1], while Agnes, for all her sweetness, is absolutely passive and colourless, except in the few scenes where her honour is at stake.

When Hebbel later in life re-read *Käthchen*, he was as much delighted with its poetic qualities as in the days of his youth, but he could not give the drama the same whole-hearted admiration as formerly; its chief fault lay in his eyes in the aristocratic prejudices of its author[2]. Wetter vom Strahl ought, in Hebbel's opinion, to have been willing to marry Käthchen before he knew that she was the daughter of the Emperor. In other words, Hebbel blames Kleist's hero for not acting as Herzog Albrecht and sacrificing everything to love. But Kleist had no desire to face the Agnes Bernauer problem; he wished above all to secure the happiness of his heroine, and this was impossible unless she was nobly born, 'und so siegst Du (Käthchen) nicht durch Dich selbst...Du siegst durch eine Pergamentrolle, durch den kaiserlichen Brief, der Dich zur Princessin von Schwaben erhebt[3].'

Already in his Hamburg treatise on Kleist and Körner, written as far back as 1836[4], Hebbel specially singles out *Der Prinz von Homburg*, 'das gelungenste aller Kleist'schen Stücke,' for careful analysis and enthusiastic praise. And in his criticism of 1849[5], written a few years before the conception of *Agnes Bernauer*, he again submits the play to a searching analysis, expresses his disapproval of the Romantic setting, but shows that it does not in any way detract from the value of the drama. It is easy to see what specially attracted Hebbel to Kleist's last creation, for more than any other of his dramas it is pre-eminently psychological, 'es steht unerschütterlich auf festen psychologischen Füssen, und die Wucherpflanzen der Romantik haben sich nur als überflüssige Arabesken herumgeschlungen[6].' Never before had Kleist been so true to life as in his last drama, the whole interest of which, strictly speaking, centres round the mental development of the hero; and the reason for this is not far to seek: Kleist himself is Homburg, and is depicting a change that actually took place in his own mind. At the beginning of his poetic career he had been an individualist, a dreamer who had blindly followed his instincts and emotions, but the political troubles of the time had shown him the

[1] Cf. Otto Brahm, *Heinrich von Kleist*, Berlin, 1884, p. 256.
[2] Entry of Feb. 21, 1845 (*Tg.* III, 21 ff.).
[3] Entry of Feb. 21, 1845 (*Tg.*, III, 24).
[4] *S. W.*, IX, 40 ff.
[5] *S. W.*, XI, 323 ff.
[6] *S. W.*, XI, 323.

importance of subordinating individual interests to the welfare of the State. And this brings us to the second point which specially appealed to Hebbel, namely the main idea underlying Kleist's drama, which closely connects it with *Agnes Bernauer*.

In 1836 Hebbel had already noted as the most important passage in the play Homburg's expostulation to Kottwitz[1]:

> Auf Ordr'? Ei Kottwitz! Reitest du so langsam?
> Hast du sie noch vom Herzen nicht empfangen?[2]

And he explains that in the commencement 'die Kraft steht über dem Gesetz und der Muth erkennt keine Schranken als sich selbst[3],' but at the close of the drama, when Homburg's moral regeneration ('Läuterung') is completed, he clearly recognizes his duties towards society. As this is the same idea which, according to the poet's own statement, is to be found in all his earlier dramas[4]—though expressed in none so clearly as in *Agnes Bernauer*—and as he already admired it in Kleist's work in 1836, we are certainly justified in assuming that Kleist was one of the first writers definitely to make clear to Hebbel the importance of submission on the part of the individual when the good of society is at stake. Graf Törring preaches the same idea vaguely and inconsistently, but Hebbel found it clearly expressed and consistently carried through in Kleist's drama. Homburg starts by being as great an individualist as Herzog Albrecht, not ready from the first, as Max Piccolomini, to sacrifice inclination to duty, and he ends by making even a greater sacrifice than Herzog Ernst for the good of the State.

As if to accentuate the resemblance to Albrecht, Hebbel lays particular stress on the fact that Homburg, like the Bavarian duke, was warned before his rash deed: 'Nichts desto weniger erfährt er durch seinen Freund Hohenzollern auf's genaueste, was der Dienst von ihm verlangt; doch was hilft's...er denkt nur an die Lorbeeren und an das Mädchen, dem er sie zu Füssen legen will, nicht an die Pflicht und an das Vaterland[5].' The likeness to Albrecht is unmistakable, especially if we—as Hebbel would have done—free the character of Kleist's prince from all romantic and somnambulistic attributes. On closer examination the means employed by both dramatists in educating the young princes to a sense of duty will also be found to have much in common. The main difference lies in the fact that, as already noted, Kleist's whole

[1] *S. W.*, IX, 39.
[2] *Prinz von Homburg*, Act II, sc. 2.
[3] *S. W.*, IX, 40.
[4] Letter of Feb. 16, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 359).
[5] *S. W.*, XI, 325.

drama is taken up with the conversion of the hero, he depicts the different stages with psychological exactitude, while in Hebbel's play Albrecht is changed from an ardent lover who lays the greatest stress on his own personal happiness to a monarch who sacrifices all for the sake of his subjects in one scene.

At the first performance of *Agnes Bernauer* a critic already noted the resemblance of Herzog Ernst to the Kurfürst in *Homburg*[1], and certainly the similarity is very marked. Both are enlightened sovereigns, who sacrifice all personal interests to the welfare of the State, both lay stress on the fact that they are no tyrants—compare: (*Ernst*) 'Ich bin kein Tyrann, und denke keiner zu werden[2],' with: (*Kurfürst*) 'Mein süsses Kind! Sieh,' wär' ich ein Tyrann, Dein Wort, das fühl' ich lebhaft, hätte mir Das Herz schon in der ehrnen Brust geschmelzt[3]'—and on the fact that they sign the death sentence only as a duty.

Although Hebbel strongly disapproved of the judgment of a contemporary critic: 'Ernst experimentirt an seinem Sohn herum[4],' he certainly held the opinion that the Kurfürst is trying to educate Homburg from the very beginning of the play: 'es ist kein Zufall, wenn der Churfürst ihm einen Posten anwies, der ihn mit seinen Leidenschaften und den Forderungen seines Blutes in Widerspruch bringen muss, er soll Beide eben bekämpfen lernen[5].' Again, and this is surely more than a chance resemblance, the regeneration of the hero is completed in both dramas by precisely the same method. If Homburg has to acknowledge the justice of the death sentence, Albrecht is also forced to judge the duke's action, and although a year elapses before he gives his decision, we are convinced that he will admit his father to have been perfectly justified in bringing about the death of Agnes.

Hebbel has himself pointed out the essential difference between his drama and Kleist's when he praises *Der Prinz von Homburg*, 'weil in ihm durch die blossen Schauer des Todes...erreicht worden ist, was in allen übrigen Tragödien nur durch den Tod selbst erreicht wird: die sittliche Läuterung und Verklärung des Helden[6].' *Der Prinz von Homburg* stops short before the death of the hero, so the reconciliation is quite probable, and the Kurfürst retains our entire sympathy, while in *Agnes Bernauer* on the other hand, although Hebbel may have convinced us of the necessity of the murder, we cannot approve of

[1] *Bw.*, VIII, 161.
Agnes Bernauer, Act IV, sc. 4.
[3] *Der Prinz von Homburg*, Act IV, sc. 1.
[4] Letter of Nov. 8, 1852 (*Bw.*, V, 73).
[5] *S. W.*, XI, 325.
[6] *S. W.*, XI, 323.

Ernst's conduct owing to our pity for Agnes[1], and we feel inclined to censure rather than admire Albrecht for so speedily becoming reconciled to his father. Grillparzer, when facing a similar problem in *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, got over the difficulty by lowering the character of the heroine. But this Hebbel would never have done, for he was intent on proving that the 'Grundidee' underlying his drama holds good under all circumstances, and therefore purposely chose an extreme case without considering the prejudices of his audience. Here we are face to face with another characteristic of Hebbel's work, and one which again shows his resemblance to Kleist, who also pushed his ideas to their logical conclusion with the same relentlessness and disregard of conventionality as his successor. If Hebbel expected his audience to sympathise with the murderer of a perfectly innocent woman, Kleist in his desire for psychological realism did not shrink from letting his hero appear on the stage as 'ein unerfreulich jammernswürd'ger Anblick[2].'

To sum up, the influence of Kleist on *Agnes Bernauer* may be traced in the idea underlying the drama, in Hebbel's psychological method, and especially in the means by which the moral regeneration of the hero is brought about.

V.

Hebbel's Deviations from History.

Although Hebbel did not as a general rule attach much importance to a faithful reproduction of the past[3], there are frequent indications in his correspondence that in *Agnes Bernauer*, his only drama on German history, he prided himself on his historical accuracy. Thus he writes to Dingelstedt: 'ich habe eine einfach rührende, menschlich schöne Handlung, treu und schlicht, wie der Chronist sie überliefert, in die Mitte gestellt[4]'; and in his interview with the king of Bavaria, he laid special stress on the historical accuracy of his drama, as compared with Törring's: 'ich habe das Thema streng historisch gefasst, mein Vorgänger aber nicht[5].' When contrasting his work with that of his predecessor, Hebbel was no doubt thinking not so much of the minor

[1] Cf. Bulthaupt, *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*, III, Leipzig, 1904, pp. 174 ff., and S. Friedmann, *Das deutsche Drama des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig, 1902, p. 185 ff.
[2] *Der Prinz von Homburg*, Act IV, sc. 1.
[3] *Modern Language Review*, IV, 308.
[4] Letter of Dec. 12, 1851 (*Bw.*, IV, 337).
[5] Cf. E. Kuh, *Biographie Hebbels*, Vienna and Leipzig, 1907, II, 342.

'kulturgeschichtliche' details, which he used so extensively in depicting the *milieu*, and which compare most favourably with Törring's vague 'ritterliche Zeit,' as of his rejection of the unhistorical intrigue; for there can be no doubt that Hebbel was perfectly in accordance with fact, when he made the Duke fully responsible for the murder. But if we examine *Agnes Bernauer* more closely, the conclusion is forced upon us that Hebbel is no more true to history in this than in his other dramas. Before, however, proceeding to examine Hebbel's deviations from history in detail it may be advisable to endeavour to account for the impression of modernity produced by the drama as a whole.

Hebbel certainly has not, as for example Kleist in *Der Prinz von Homburg*, repudiated any effort to arrive at historical accuracy; but on the other hand he has not given that perfect embodiment of the spirit of the age which is so admirable in Kleist. Although the principal persons and events of Hebbel's drama are historical, yet notwithstanding the mass of detail with which the poet tried to reproduce the period, the problems and characters are not those of the fifteenth century. As in Ibsen's earlier historical dramas, the background of the play is mediæval, but the foreground modern. Both poets' interest in psychology was so much stronger than their interest in history that they laid more stress on the struggle in the mind of the individual than on the historical event. As in *Kongsemnerne* Skule mainly interested Ibsen, so Ernst first attracted Hebbel to the story of Agnes Bernauer[1]; but both Earl Skule and Herzog Ernst are thoroughly modern figures. There can be no doubt that Ernst is as great an anachronism in the Middle Ages as Golo[2] is, though Ernst is much more sympathetic and convincing. Theoretically Hebbel demanded that every character should be rooted in his time, but in practice he never seems to have realised that human beings are not the same in all ages; most surprising of all, this poet, who insisted so much on individuality, seems to have interpreted every character in the light of his own complicated psychological experience. Hebbel's characters, as a rule, bear a striking resemblance to the poet himself; they are always reflecting even when we should expect them to be exclusively taken up with external events. Thus many passages in Hebbel's dramas might be—and some actually are—taken from his

[1] Letter of Dec. 14, 1854 (*Bw.*, v, 205): 'Sie haben ganz recht, dass der Verfasser selbst auf der Seite des alten Herzogs steht und zwar so entschieden, dass nur dieser ihn für den ganzen Gegenstand entzündet hat.'

[2] Cf. B. Golz, l.c., p. 116: 'Golo...ist durch und durch modern, zerfressen von Reflexion.'

diaries. To select but one out of innumerable examples, could anything be more characteristic of Hebbel than Albrecht's reflection in the midst of a passionate love scene: 'All uns're Wollust mündet in Gott, was uns're enge Brust nicht fasst, das fluthet in die seinige hinüber, er ist nur glücklich, wenn wir selig sind, soll er nicht glücklich sein? Und zuweilen stösst er die Welle zurück, dann überströmt sie den Menschen, und er ist auf einmal dahin, wandelt im Paradiese und spürt keine Veränderung' (Act III, sc. 9). This resemblance to the poet applies in a higher degree to Herzog Ernst than to any other character Hebbel has created. Kulke has drawn attention to the striking similarity, 'So wie Ernst mit Preising spricht, also sprach Hebbel,' and he specially notes that Hebbel has endowed his prototype with one of his most characteristic traits: 'das Despotische in der Form der Gerechtigkeit[1].' So far has Hebbel gone in the identification of himself with Ernst, that he has put a Low German word such as 'twatsch' into the mouth of the Bavarian duke (Act III, sc. 6).

In considering in detail Hebbel's deviations from his sources, it will be observed that some changes were made for purposes of character delineation, others for the sake of motivation and colouring, but that the majority are concessions to the all powerful 'idea.' Thus it has already been noted that the emphasis laid on Agnes's position in Augsburg, when the play opens, and the introduction of her jealous friends, are closely connected with Hebbel's conception of the harmful effect of beauty on its surroundings. In a letter of August 1853, Gutzkow blames Hebbel for devoting two whole acts to Albrecht's wooing, but adds truly enough 'freilich die Augsburger Badestube hat für die Charakteristik zu viel Verlockendes gehabt[2].' It is to this desire of Hebbel to paint the *milieu* in which Agnes grew up that we owe the excellent figure of Caspar Bernauer, who is slightly reminiscent of Meister Anton in *Maria Magdalena*, and for which the poet has borrowed several traits from his own father. On the other hand the apprentice Theobald, who also bears witness to the misfortune that Agnes's beauty has brought upon the world, is distinctly related to Brackenburg[3].

Act I, sc. 15—18. There seems to have been a popular tradition that Albrecht first met Agnes at a dance[4]; Hebbel may have followed

[1] E. Kulke, *Erinnerungen an F. Hebbel*, Vienna, 1878, p. 13 f.
[2] *Hebbel's Briefwechsel*, herausgegeben v. F. Bamberg, Berlin, 1890, II, 153.
[3] Cf. also the unfortunate lover Ephraim in *Judith*.
[4] C. Meyer, *Agnes Bernauer im Lichte der neuesten geschichtlichen Forschung* (Westermann's *Ill. Monatshefte*, 1904, Nr 12).

this, but was more probably influenced by Stettin's description of the festivities in honour of the visit of Prince Philip to Augsburg in 1496[1]. Historically the scene is impossible, for the patricians would not have admitted the daughter of a 'Bader' to their dances. Hebbel must have been aware of this, for there are repeated references in Werlich and Stettin to a separate 'Tanzhaus für die Geschlechter' (for example, Stettin, pp. 153, 220, 258).

Act II. Only one invention in this act calls for notice. Several of Hebbel's sources, for example Mannert and Lipowsky, mention that Albrecht tried other means of gaining Agnes's love before offering her marriage. Hebbel, who has ennobled Albrecht, has let Graf Törring make the attempt.

Act III, sc. 1—6. In Ernst's discussion of State affairs with his Chancellor, his treatment of the Jews alone calls for notice. Nothing could be less mediæval than Ernst's methods of dealing with this problem, and Karl Werner relates that the application to modern conditions was clearly felt by the audience at a reading of *Agnes Bernauer*[2]. Another touch characteristic of Hebbel is the fact that Ernst builds the college of Andechs in extenuation for the sins of his youth. In reality this college was not built until several years after the death of Agnes Bernauer[3]; Hebbel's reason for altering the date will be seen later.

Act III, sc. 10—13. Hebbel's motivation of the scene of the tournament is far superior to that of any of his sources. According to Törring and Lipowsky the tournament is held to recall Albrecht to a sense of honour by degrading him publicly. In Hebbel's drama Ernst holds the tournament to announce Albrecht's engagement to Anna von Braunschweig, and so silence the rumours of his relations with Agnes. He only refuses his son admission as a last resort on his absolute refusal to comply with his father's wishes. Albrecht's declaration of his marriage follows as a matter of course, and then the duke, as conceived by Hebbel, has no alternative but to force Albrecht into 'private life[4]' by proclaiming his nephew heir to the dukedom. This proclamation is absolutely unhistorical and is probably the very last thing the real Ernst would have done, for it is the action of a modern prince imbued with Hebbel's notions of the responsibility of a ruler

[1] Cf. *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, p. 322.
[2] *Briefwechsel*, edited Bamberg, II, 42.
[3] Cf. K. Mannert, *Die Geschichte Bayerns*, Leipzig, 1826, p. 472, and J. H. von Falckenstein's *Geschichte...Baierns*, Munich, 1763, p. 458.
[4] Letter of Nov. 8, 1852 (*Bw.*, V, 73).

to his subjects, and ready to make every sacrifice for their welfare. Quite a modern touch is Hebbel's deviation with regard to the striking of Albrecht. Several of his sources, for example Törring and Falkenstein, state that the duke struck his son on this occasion. In the drama Ernst in his first burst of rage on hearing of the marriage rushes towards Albrecht, but quickly controls himself with the reflection, 'was erhitzt der Vater sich, der Herzog genügt.'

Act IV, sc. 1—4. In this act several important deviations claim our attention, for it is in the first scenes that Hebbel tries to convince us that Ernst was absolutely obliged, even from a modern point of view, to bring about the death of Agnes, and he could only achieve this object by deviating considerably from his sources. At the commencement of the act Preising is discovered reading the death sentence of Agnes, which according to Hebbel was drawn up by impartial legal experts immediately after her marriage. The poet has himself admitted that this sentence is absolutely unhistorical, 'Übrigens werden Sie in der Bairischen Geschichte...das Rechtsgutachten meines Stücks nicht finden[1].' Kulke has recorded a remark of Hebbel's on this subject, which illustrates how very little value he attached to historical accuracy when it was a question of working out an idea. 'Als ob dadurch, dass zwei oder drei Professoren in einem alten Archive eine Urkunde entdecken, welche zufällig das vom Dichter benutzte Moment historisch beglaubigt und sicher stellt, an dem inneren Zusammenhang, an der Motivierung des Dramas irgend etwas gebessert oder überhaupt geändert würde[2].' Hebbel names the legal authorities, who have drawn up this imaginary deed—Kraitmayr, mentioned by Falckenstein as having written a defence of the murder, Adlzreiter[3] and Emeran Nusperger zu Kalmberg, whose unsuitability for the task has already been noticed. We now come to the second fact, which according to Hebbel justified Ernst in committing the murder, namely the death of the little Prince Adolf. In this point also Hebbel is at variance with his sources, all of whom definitely affirm that Adolf died in 1437, that is, several years after the drowning of Agnes. Lipowsky, when speaking of the poisoning charge brought against Agnes (p. 29), lays emphasis on the fact that Adolf survived her, so Hebbel must

[1] Letter of Dec. 14, 1854 (*Bw.*, v, 206).

[2] Kulke, *Erinnerungen an Hebbel*, p. 12.

[3] It is interesting to note in this connection that Riezler is very indignant at the mention of Kraitmayr and Adlzreiter, 'dass Hebbel aber Adlzreiter und Kreitmayr als Räte Ernsts ein juristisches Gutachten über den Fall verfassen lässt, übersteigt doch jedes Maas poetischer Licenz.' S. Riezler, *Untersuchungen über Agnes Bernauer und die baierischen Herzöge* (*Sitzungsber. der Münchener Akademie*, 1885, xv, p. 302).

have known that in this respect also he was quite unhistorical. This and the preceding point strike at the root of Hebbel's theory that the poet often represents history more faithfully than the historian, for the historical Ernst really had no justification for murdering his son's wife beyond that, as Riezler points out[1], of keeping the dukedom in the hands of his descendants, a reason which Hebbel would most certainly not have considered adequate. Again, if Adolf survived Agnes, God could not have indicated to Ernst the path to be followed. In a word, it is quite evident that Hebbel knowingly altered the facts in order to make them fit into his theories.

Next comes the question of the accusation of poisoning brought against Agnes. In the drama Agnes is accused of witchcraft by the people, and is supposed to have brought about the death of Duke Wilhelm, his wife and their son Adolf. Ernst according to Hebbel does not for an instant believe in the poisoning charge, 'es ist thörigt, mit den gemeinen Leuten von Zauberei zu reden, wo ein Gesicht, das unser Herrgott zwei Mal angestrichen hat, Alles erklärt' (Act v, sc. 6), but is forced very much against his will to sacrifice Agnes for the sake of his subjects; he writes to the Emperor *before the murder*, explaining his motives and asking him to interfere, if necessary, to restore Albrecht to a sense of his responsibilities. Now the historical Ernst also wrote to the emperor concerning Agnes Bernauer, but from quite different motives. At the end of his book Lipowsky has quoted several historical documents, among them Ernst's instructions to his chancellor, when sent on a mission to the Emperor fourteen days *after the murder*. Riezler has pointed out[2] that these instructions certainly do not place Ernst in a very favourable light. They were written after Albrecht had joined Ludwig of Ingolstadt, and Ernst was desirous of securing the Emperor's protection by giving his version of the murder. He is evidently fully aware of the unrighteousness of the deed, and in order to defend his conduct he brings charges against Agnes, which he must have been aware were absolutely unfounded, thus he tells the Emperor that she was 'ein böses Weib' who tried to poison not only Albrecht (her own husband!), but also his nephew Adolf. The duke, who must have known that Adolf had been weak from infancy, plainly showed how little he himself believed in these charges, when he subsequently joined his son in decreeing a perpetual mass to the memory of Agnes. Could anything be more unlike Hebbel's conception of Ernst than his

[1] l.c. p. 302.
[2] S. Riezler, *Bairische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1889, III, 323.

historical namesake, who in the meanest way sought to stifle the voice of his conscience and gain the help of the emperor by blackening his victim after death? As Hebbel seems to have read Lipowsky most carefully, he must have read these instructions, especially as Lipowsky (p. 29) comments on the utter groundlessness of the poisoning charge and tries to excuse Ernst by the supposition that he was himself deceived. Hebbel must therefore have been fully aware how unhistorical was his conception of the duke. As there is no other reference to an accusation of poisoning in any of Hebbel's sources, it is probable that the fact that the Bavarians regarded Agnes as bringing destruction on the ducal house is an invention of the poet.

Act IV, sc. 6. As Ernst's proclamation of Adolf as his successor is unhistorical, it follows that Ernst did not endeavour to persuade his son to abdicate. There is also no reference in any source to Ernst persuading the Emperor not to call Albrecht to account for his disturbance of the peace at the tournament.

Act V, sc. 6. The fact that Hebbel does not agree with any of his sources in the account of Agnes's death may possibly point to another unknown source, but it is much more probable that Hebbel altered the actual details to fit in with his conception of Agnes, especially as he censures Melchior Meyer for not omitting details such as 'der gräuliche Zug von dem Henker, der freilich historisch ist, den aber doch gewiss nur ein mit Spiess und Kramer verwandtes Gemüth auf Nadeln stecken kann[1].'

Act V, sc. 8. It is rather difficult to see why Hebbel deviated from his sources as to the defeat of Ernst. The historical duke certainly was not utterly defeated by his son, and in the drama Ernst intends to overthrow Albrecht ('ich werfe ihn oder halte ihn auf, bis der Kaiser kommt', Act IV, sc. 4), makes most careful preparations to this effect, and yet is entirely defeated by Albrecht's hastily collected followers at the first onset.

Act V, sc. 10. The interference of the Emperor again is quite unhistorical, but is perfectly in agreement with Hebbel's conception of the drama, 'das Reich mit allen seinen Elementen, steht dahinter, wie ein ungeheurer Berg mit Donner und Blitz[2].' Ernst's abdication and retirement to a monastery is Hebbel's last great concession to the 'idea.' In discussing the ideas underlying the play it has already been noted[3] that the abdication of the monarch played an important part

[1] Letter of Jan. 26, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 347).
[2] Letter of Dec. 29, 1851 (*Bw.*, IV, 337).
[3] *Modern Language Review*, IV, 305.

in all Hebbel's plans of illustrating the tragic aspect of the kingship. Ernst's retirement into a monastery also explains Hebbel's motive for altering the date of the building of Andechs, to which reference has already been made. Quite apart from the ethical value of the idea, the question presents itself: was it a very prudent course from a practical point of view for Ernst to entrust the government of the dukedom to his inexperienced son and, above all, was it conducive to the welfare of the people, which Ernst, according to Hebbel, regarded more than all personal considerations?

The close of the drama was influenced by Kleist's *Prinz von Homburg*, and is of course absolutely unhistorical; after the lapse of a year Albrecht is to pronounce judgment on his father, and Ernst declares that he will submit to his decree.

In answer to a criticism of his *Nibelungen* trilogy, Hebbel expressed the opinion that slight deviations from history occasionally add to the beauty of a drama; 'ich zähle diese Anachronismen u.s.w. zu den kleinen Mysterien der Kranzwinderinnen, von denen behauptet wird, dass sie ganz zuletzt noch mit unbarmherzig rauher Hand über ihre sorgfältig zu Stande gebrachte bunte Schöpfung fahren, um ihr durch den Anschein der Nachlässigkeit grössere Natürlichkeit zu geben[1].' A few of these anachronisms, for which there is no reason except the whim or carelessness of the poet, are also to be found in *Agnes Bernauer*. Thus in Act I, sc. 18, the Bürgermeister of Augsburg introduces his niece Juliana Peutenger to Notthaft von Wernberg, and tells him that as a child of four years she welcomed the Emperor to Augsburg in a Latin speech. Stettin (p. 258) relates precisely the same incident under the year 1504, so Hebbel has altered the date by over seventy years. Other examples of inaccuracies which come under this heading are: (1) The question of the divorce of Margaretha Maultasch (Act IV, sc. 5), to which reference has already been made[2]. (2) The amount of money to be paid by the Duke of Würtemberg to Ernst as compensation for his daughter's elopement (Act III, sc. 6). Hebbel's sources fix the sum at 10,000 gulden[3], while the poet wrote first 30,000 gulden and then 25,000. (3) Death of Elizabeth the mother of Albrecht, who died 1432[4] (after Albrecht's marriage to Agnes); in the drama Albrecht (Act II, sc. 10) on the day of his first meeting with Agnes already speaks of his mother as dead.

There yet remains one important deviation for which it is very

[1] Letter of Dec. 2, 1858 (*Bw.*, VI, 215).
[2] *Modern Language Review*, IV, 317.
[3] For example Lipowsky, p. 9.
[4] Lipowsky, p. 87.

difficult to account. Hebbel notes under the names of the characters, 'Die Handlung ereignet sich zwischen 1420 und 1430,' yet every one of his sources, including Törring, places the murder of Agnes Bernauer considerably later (either in 1435 or 1436). It is evident that this one deviation must throw the entire chronology of the play into confusion; thus for example in 1430 Herzog Wilhelm was not dead, and the little Prince Adolf had not yet been born. The obvious explanation is, of course, that Hebbel made a mistake and wrote 1420–30 instead of 1430–40; but, on the other hand, it does not seem very probable that he would have overlooked the date of the heroine's death. As the explanations which might be suggested to account for the deviation are not at all satisfactory[1], it is just possible that Hebbel was following an unknown source.

In the course of the foregoing investigation of the sources of Hebbel's *Agnes Bernauer* it has been shown that the poet, according to his wont, started with the definite intention of giving poetic expression to several of his characteristic ideas, and carried out his purpose with the utmost consistency. The immediate stimulus doubtless came from the drama on the same subject by Graf Törring, whose inconsistent treatment of the character of Herzog Ernst especially revealed to Hebbel the psychological possibilities of the theme. Hebbel was influenced by Törring not only in the main trend of the drama, that is, in laying such stress on the subordination of the individual to the State, but also as regards *technique*, the similarity of construction being especially striking towards the close of the two plays. From Lipowsky's history of *Agnes Bernauerinn*, on the other hand, Hebbel borrowed the main plot of his drama, as well as many minor incidents. To Mannert's and Falckenstein's histories of Bavaria and to Stettin's and Werlich's chronicles, he was indebted for such historical facts as he thought necessary for a vivid delineation of the *milieu*. Finally, the influence of Kleist may be traced in Hebbel's psychological method, especially in the means by which the moral regeneration of the hero is brought about.

Agnes Löwenstein.

London.

[1] For example Lipowsky (pp. 15—73) distinctly states that the tournament at which Albrecht first saw Agnes took place in 1428, and in Hebbel's drama two and a half years are supposed to elapse between the marriage and death of Agnes (Act iv, sc. 4).

UNBEKANNTE JUGENDGEDICHTE VON CARL FRIEDRICH CRAMER.

In der Bibliothek meines Freundes Carl Claudius in Kopenhagen, des weit über die Grenzen seines Vaterlandes hinaus bekannten Sammlers historischer Musikinstrumente, fand ich eine Originalhandschrift unbekannter Jugendgedichte von Carl Friedrich Cramer: ein in dunkelroten Plüsch gebundenes kleines Oktavbuch, 73 Blätter, von holländischem Papier mit einem Wasserzeichen von J. Honig & Zoon. Die Schriftzüge sind dieselben wie auf den ebenfalls von Cramer beschriebenen Seiten 215 bis 235 des Göttinger Hainbundbuches A 1, dessen Einsicht mir der jetzige Besitzer, Herr Professor Dr Klussmann in Hamburg, bereitwilligst gestattete.

Die Handschrift enthält:

(Titelblatt) *Poesien von C. F. Cramer.*

(1) *An Doris.* 35 Zeilen.
(2) *Ode.* 3 vierzeilige Strophen.
(3) *Ode. Nach der 3ten des IV Buches des Horazius.* 16 Hexameter.
(4) *Ode, an einen Freund.* 34 Zeilen im ersten archilochischen Versmass.
(5) *Ode bey dem Tode Friedrichs des fünften.* 9 Strophen in demselben asklepiadeischen Versmass wie **21**.
(6) *Ode. Tialf und Skrymner.* S. unten.
(7) *Ode. An Daphnen.* 7 vierzeilige Strophen.
(8) *Ode.* 5 vierzeilige Strophen.
(9) *An den Bach.* 11 Distichen.
(10) *Ode. An Doris.* 6 vierzeilige Strophen.
(11) *Ode. An einen Freund.* 8 vierzeilige Strophen.

(12) und (13): Petrarcaoden, mitgeteilt im vorigen Bande dieser Zeitschrift, S. 192 ff. und S. 374 ff.

(Titelblatt) *Poesien von C. F. Cramer. Zweyte Abtheilung.*

(14) *Den* 7 *Nov.* 1770. *Ode an Lucinden bey ihrer Abreiſe.* 19 vierzeilige Strophen.

(15) *Den* 20 *Januar* 1770. *Ode. Youngs Klagen über den Tod ſeiner Lucia.* 6 fünfzeilige Strophen.

(16) *Den* 14 *Januar* 1770. *Ode.* Dänisch. 5 vierzeilige Strophen.

(17) *Ode. Til Daphne.* Dänisch. 5 sechszeilige Strophen.

(18) *Sympathie. In dythyrambiſchen Sylbenmaaße.* 215 Zeilen.

(19) *Ode an die Weisheit.* 5 vierzeilige Strophen.

(20) *Ode.* 9 vierzeilige Strophen.

(21) *Ode, an einen Freund.* S. unten.

(22) *Den* 18 *Nov.* 1770. *Ode auf den Mangle Berg an Eliſen.* 14 Strophen in demselben asklepiadeischen Versmass wie **12** und **13**.

(23) *An den Mond.* 6 achtzeilige Strophen.

(24) *An die kleine Themire.* 6 fünfzeilige Strophen.

(25) *Ode. An eine Freundinn über Youngs Nachtgedanken.* Vierzeilige Strophen; nur 7 Verse erhalten, weil am Ende der Handschrift einige Blätter fehlen.

Sämtliche Gedichte sind reimlos, zwanzig davon werden ja als 'Oden' bezeichnet. Sklavische Anlehnung an Klopstock in Form und Inhalt kennzeichnet die meisten dieser Versuche des Dichterjünglings, der noch ganz in der Nachahmung befangen ist. Der landschaftliche Hintergrund in einigen von diesen Gedichten weist auf die kopenhagener Jugendzeit Cramers und auf Sandholm, das Landgut seines Vaters bei Kopenhagen, den Schauplatz des Skaldengedichts von Gerstenberg. Die beiden dänischen Oden sind in flüssigen Versen geschrieben und bekunden die völlige Beherrschung dieser Sprache. Die Einreihung der vier aus dem Jahre 1770 datierten Gedichte zeigt, dass die Anordnung der Sammlung nicht chronologisch ist. Den Gedichten sind vier Sinnsprüche und zahlreiche Anmerkungen beigegeben, in denen der junge Cramer seine Belesenheit und Gelehrsamkeit zeigt; in einer von diesen wird Klopstock 'der grösste Dichter aller Zeiten' genannt.

Neben den früher mitgeteilten Petrarcaoden dürften die Eislaufoden **6** und **21** ein gewisses Interesse verdienen; sie mögen deshalb mit Cramers Anmerkungen hier Platz finden.

(6) Ode.

Tialf und Skrymner[1].

Tialf.

Hier, Rieſe, ſteh' ich beſchuht, mit Flügeln des Winds
Komm ſtreite mit mir in dem Lauf
Hier auf dem blinkenden Eis, ich fordre dich laut
Zum Tanze des Eisſchuhes auf.

Schon fleugt mein eilender Fuß, in gleitendem Schwung
Die eben glänzende Bahn
Nicht hier o Rieſe wie dort, beym moſigten Fels
Beſiegſt du des Tanzenden Fuß.

Auf, auf, und zögre nicht mehr! Beflügle dich bald
Zum Flug auf dem Rücken des Stroms
Siehſt du am Ende der Bahn beym fernen Gebüſch
Die ſchimmernde Pforte von Eis!

Den hellen Spiegel der Sonn' im farbigtem Hang
Wie er mit blendendem Licht
Den Thau der Blumen beſtrahlt[2] die ſez ich zum Ziel
Des gleitenden Laufs auf dem Eis.

Skrymner.

Ha Jüngling! meineſt du daß im ſchwindelndem Tanz
Der Rücken des Stromes mich trägt?
Die Schweere meines Gewichts zerbräche das Eis
Begönn' des Eisſtahles Lauf.

Doch wenn im Fluge des Winds zu laufen du wähnſt
So komme mein Sohn von dem Fels
Der dort in Wolken ſein Haupt verhüllet, herab!
Dann ſieg' in des Eisſtahles Lauf!

Tialf.

Er komm' er komme herab, vom Felſen herab
Ich ſtreite mit ihm um den Sieg
Und wenn er nicht wie der Nord die Bahn hinauf fliegt
So ſieget ſo ſieget er nicht.

Iſt das o Rieſe dein Sohn, am Ende der Bahn?
Ha! fürchterlich fürchterlich ſchnell
Schießt er vom Hange des Bergs, des Schneebergs herab
Aufs blinkende ſchwankende Eis.

O ſchneller eilender Lauf! Schon kömmt er mir gleich
Wie flieget, wie fliegt er dahin!
Schnell wie vom Bogen des Tyrs[3] ein ſchwirrender Pfeil
So gleitet er fort auf dem Eis.

Geſieget haſt du, geſiegt! Da wiegt er ſich ſchon
Am farbigten Hange von Eis!
So wie des Eisſtahles Gott beflügelt am Fuß
Kam er meinem Laufe zuvor.

[1] Thor und Tialf zwey himmliſche Jünglinge, gingen auf die Erde, um ihre Leibesſtärke und Geſchicklichkeit zu verſuchen. Sie ſiegten überall, bis ſie zulezt zu einem Rieſen kamen der Scrymner hieß. Hier verlohren ſie in allem, auch ſo gar im Schritſchuh laufen. Wie es aber hernach heraus kam, ſo fand's ſich daß alle dieſe Sofen (?) Zaubereyen

und Verblendungen waren, und daß der Riese anstatt seines Sohnes ein Phantom unter der Gestalt desselben hatte laufen lassen. Geister sind freilich hurtiger als Menschen. Dieses ist eine Fabel der nordischen Mythologie wovon man den Auszug aus der Edda von Herrn Prof. Mallet nachsehen kan. Der Augenblick den ich zur Ode gewählt habe ist der wo Tialf den Skrymner auffodert, und von dem Phantome überwunden wird.

[2] Niemand als wer diese Schönheit der Natur selbst gesehen hat, oder sie von patriotischen Schweizern hat erzählen hören kann diese Stelle recht verstehen.—In der Schweiz giebt es Flüße die an dem Fuße der Alpen fließen; diese Alpen sind oft mit Schnee und Eis bedekt, und die Flüsse zugefroren. Auf der andern Seite des Fluß[es] blühen unterdessen Blumen, und zuweilen hängt von den Alpen ein Eiszapfe, von der Dike des größten Eichenbaumes, und der Gestalt einer Ehrenpforte herab. Vielleicht wird man aus dieser Beschreibung verstehen können was in der Ode 'die Pforte von Eis,' sey, 'die die Strahlen der Sonne bricht, und auf den Thau der Blumen zurükwirft die auf der andern Seite des Flußes stehen.'

[3] *Tyr*, war der Krigs Gott der alten Deutschen eben das was *Mars* bey den Lateinern und Griechen.

(21) Ode,

an einen Freund.

Reizend ist das Gefild, wenn eine Lenzes Nacht
(Da vor Cynthias Blick gänzlich der Strahl entflieht
Der den Traubenberg färbt, röthlich mit hellem Glanz
Nun in Wellen zurücke weicht,)
Vom Olympus herab, sich auf der Abendluft
Kühlen Fittigen senkt, und im umschattendem
Zartem Laube des Walds, säuselnd ein Zephyr weht
Und auf thauigten Fluren schwebt,

Wenn der Nachtigall Stimm sich mit des Baches Ton
Sanft vermischet und süß tönet der fühlenden
Der verwundeten Brust, dann sind die Gegenden
Für empfindende Herzen schön

Aber schöner sind sie, schöner und reizender
Wenn die Felder erstart, und auf den Flüssen nun
Die der eiserne Frost mit dem Crystall bezieht
Sich der schwebende Jüngling wiegt.

Freund! wir wandelten schon auf der bereiften Flur
Durch das raffelnde Laub, gingen mit leiserm Schritt
Mit der Ehrfurcht erfüllt, die man den Gräbern zollt
An dem heiligem Hügel hin.

Wo der Freund des Halvards durch die Entzückungen
Trunkner Freude beraufcht, badend den jungen Leib
Froh in dem Sonnenglanz, schwebend in Harmonie
Von dem Dichter gesehen ward.

Jezo schimmerte fern, unserm entzücktem Aug
Schon im silbernen Glanz, blizend den Mondenschein
Von der Glätte zurück, jener berühmte See
Wo Blakullur sich badete.

Freund! was sahen wir da! Sag es der Nachwelt, Lied
Sage, Telyn, es laut.—Mit der Begeistrung Ton
Sings o *Braga*[1] durch mich! Denn auf der blanken See
Sahn wir mehr noch als *Gerstenberg*.

Ja! Denn baden sah er, wir aber sahn den Schwung
Den auf glänzender Bahn, tanzend die Göttin flog
Sags!...Nein! schweige, mein Lied! Schweige vom größeren
Denn du singst's nicht wie Gerstenberg

37 Das geringere fang. Schweig! und entehre nicht
Durch den fchwächern Accord und durch misklingenden
Ton, das hohe Geficht das auf der blanken See
Du zu fehen gewürdigt wardft.

41 Diefes fprach ich und (mit niedergefenktem Blik
Auf das helle Criftall, ftehend im heilgem Hayn
Grauer Eichen die izt waren vom Sturm beraubt
Ihrer Blätter,) da wünfcht' ich fo:

45 'Möchteft du doch hier feyn, der du fo fchnell als Thorr
'Da er von dem Phantom, täufchend betrogen ward
'Das vom Schneeberg herab, Scrymner einft fendete
'Auf der fchimmernden Ebne fleugft!

49 'Und des Leyer wie Njords[2] filberne Telyn klingt
'Wenn nach feinem Accord hüpfend der Eisfels tanzt
'Wenn, der Steinkluft enttönt, folgfam der Eichenhayn
'Wie ein fcherzendes Lamm ihm folgt,

53 'Wärft! ach, wäreft du hier! Würdiger fängest du
'Trinkend filbernes Naß, aus dem ertönendem
'Quell des Braga[3] den Schwung, welchen mit glattem Stahl
'Auf dem Eife die Göttinn flog.

57 'Nur dem feinerem Aug fichtbar, dem Bardenaug
'Der empfinden kann, Freund! Dann, o dann würd' uns hier
'Herthafee[4], diefe Fluth, und von dem Eis bereift
'Dieß Gefilde Vallhalla feyn.'

[1] *Braga* war bey den alten Deutfchen und Dänen der Gott der Dichtkunft, eben das was bey den Griechen Apollo.
[2] *Njord*, der nordifche Orpheus.
[3] Der Quell des Braga, war, was bey den Griechen, die Hippocrene.
[4] *Herthafee* war ein See worin fich die Göttinn Hertha zu baden pflegte. Zu diefem Bade gelaffen zu werden ward von den alten Druiden und Barden für den gröften Grad von Glückfeeligkeit gehalten deffen ein Sterblicher fähig war, ob er gleich, wie die Fabel unter ihnen lautete, gleich darauf fterben mußte.

Die poetische Phraseologie des Eislaufs in **6** und **21** ist Klopstock entlehnt: 'Crystall, Schwung, Stahl, bereift, schweben, tanzen' u.s.w.; im Einzelnen sind seine Eislaufoden 'Braga' und 'Die Kunst Tialfs' nachgeahmt.

'Braga' (M.-P. I, 188) ist im Dezember 1766 gedichtet und zuerst 1771 in der zweiten Auflage des *Hypochondristen* und in der Hamburger Ausgabe der *Oden* gedruckt worden. **6** ist Ausführung von 'Braga' 58 ff.:

...Tialf, dem nie einer in dem Laufe voran,
Wie des Zaubernden beseeltes Phantom,
Tönte! Da röthete der Zorn Tialf!

'Phantom' (*Hyp.* und *Oden*) sagt auch Cramer: **6**, Anmerkung[1], und **21**. 46. Die Bewegung des Phantoms schildern in wörtlicher Übereinstimmung **6**. 31 und **21**. 47. In **21**. 30 und 31 bildet Cramer die Versanfänge von 'Braga' 54 und 30 nach. Vers 54 beginnt im *Hypochondristen* 'Tön's, Mundstringa, laut!', in den *Oden* 'Tön' es,

Telyn, laut!'; Vers 30 im *Hypochondristen* 'Sing es,' in den *Oden* 'Sing's, o.' Beidesmal folgt Cramer der Lesart der *Oden*.

'Die Kunst Tialfs' (M.-P. 1, 215) ist wahrscheinlich im Dezember 1767 entstanden und erschien ebenfalls erst 1771 im Druck, nämlich in der zweiten Auflage des *Hypochondristen*, in den Darmstädter *Oden und Elegien* und in den Hamburger *Oden*. In der Hamburger Ausgabe ist die Ode um mehrere Strophen vermehrt. Erst in diesen Zusatzstrophen finden wir die Verse 73 ff.:

> Hier die hundertfarbige Pforte vorbey, dem siegenden Winter
> Auf der Gletscher Höh wie Bogen der Triumphe gebaut,
> Dort den Klee des Thals vorbey,

Verse, die Cramer in **6.** 12 ff. nachahmt und in seiner Anmerkung[2] gewissermassen mitkommentiert. Auch zu **6.** 27 kann 'Die Kunst Tialfs' 97 f. nur in der Lesart der *Oden* angezogen werden:

> Und tanzten fort, bald wie auf Flügeln des Nords
> Den Strom hinunter gestürmt!

Gerstenberg hatte Blakullur im Bade, Klopstock hatte Braga auf dem Eise besungen; aus diesen beiden Prämissen ergab sich die poetische Vision von **21**: Blakullur auf dem Eise. Ort, wie bei Gerstenberg und Klopstock: der See am Skaldenhain auf Sandholm; Zeit, wie in 'Braga': eine Mondscheinnacht.

In **21** parodiert Cramer Klopstocks Ode 'Der Zürchersee' (M.-P. 1, 83). Cramer kannte die Ode in zwei leicht von einander abweichenden Fassungen, der ältesten aus dem Entstehungsjahre 1750 und der jüngeren, die zum ersten Mal in den *Oden*, Hamburg 1771, erscheint, denn seine Parodie nimmt auf beide Fassungen Bezug. Es entsprechen sich die Verse:

'Der Zürchersee.'			21.
1—2		Schön ist...schöner	1, 12, 13;
49	(1750)	Reizend...	
61		Aber süsser ists noch, schöner und reizender	
66 ff.		...und mit gesenktem Blick, Auf die silberne(n) Welle(n), That mein Herze den frommen Wunsch:	41—44;
69	(1750)	Möchtet ihr auch hier seyn,	45,
	(1771)	Wäret ihr auch bey uns,	53;
74 ff.	(1750)	...wir nennten dann Jenen Schatten-Wald, Tempe, Diese Thäler, Elysium.	58—60. Aus der ältesten Fassung scheint 'dann,' aus der jüngeren 'uns' in Cramers Parodie übergegangen zu sein.
	(1771)	...Der Schattenwald Wandelt' uns sich in Tempe, Jenes Thal in Elysium!	

Cramer kannte also, als er **6** und **21** dichtete, gewisse Oden Klopstocks bereits in derjenigen Textgestalt, die Klopstock ihnen für die erste von ihm selbst besorgte Ausgabe seiner *Oden* gegeben hatte, die im Herbst 1771 bei Bode in Hamburg erschien. Etwa um dieselbe Zeit dürften **6** und **21** entstanden sein. Und bald nachher, ehe er im Frühjahr 1772 die Universität Göttingen bezog, dürfte Cramer die vorliegende Sammlung seiner Jugendgedichte niedergeschrieben haben. Eine ältere Schicht innerhalb dieser Sammlung lässt sich daran erkennen, dass Cramer den asklepiadeischen Vers statt des Pentameters gebraucht, wie in **7**, **8** und **9**, oder umgekehrt, wie in **12** und **13**, wo noch über ein Drittel der asklepiadeischen Verse durch Pentameter verdrängt werden. Demgegenüber zeigt **22**, gedichtet am 18. November 1770, Cramers zunehmende Sicherheit in der Verwendung des asklepiadeischen Verses. In den 28 asklepiadeischen Versen der Ode **22** hapert es nur noch dreimal: ein Vers hat ××́× statt ×́×× unmittelbar nach der Cäsur, und in zwei anderen ist das Schema der ersten Vershälfte auch auf die zweite übertragen, wodurch Pentameter von der freieren Art entstehen. Einen weiteren Fortschritt über **22** hinaus zeigt dann **5** und über **5** hinaus unsere Eislaufode **21**. Cramers asklepiadeische Verse sind zwar auch in **21** noch nicht ganz einwandfrei: Vers 21 erleidet eine Verschiebung der Hebung und Senkung vor der Cäsur, Vers 23 wird in seiner ersten Hälfte von dem daktylischen Schwung seiner Umgebung mitgerissen—beides an einer Stelle, wo der musikalische Rhythmus Gerstenbergscher Verse[1] in unsere Ode hineinklingt,—und im Vers 41 wird es als Härte empfunden, dass Parenthese und Cäsur nicht zusammenfallen. Aber es mischt sich doch kein einziger Pentameter mehr unter die 45 asklepiadeischen Verse, die das Metrum der Ode erheischt, so dass **21** auch von diesem Gesichtspunkt aus als eins der jüngeren Stücke der Sammlung erscheint.

JULIUS FREUND.

SHEFFIELD.

[1] *Gedicht eines Skalden*, Erster Gesang, V. 9—15 (*DLD d. 18. u. 19. Jh.*, 30, S. 359):

bade ganz
Den neuen Leib in Sonnenglanz,...
Bin ganz Entzückung,...
Und walle trunken in der Fluth
Der hohen Harmonie!
Wo ruht
Mein schwebender Geist...?

'THE ATHENIAN VIRTUOSI' AND 'THE ATHENIAN SOCIETY.'

If any special apology is necessary for the treatment of two obscure institutions of essentially unrelated history and aims in a single paper, it is found in the fact that the obscurity surrounding both has led in the past to confusion, a confusion that is still continued, for example, in the 'Academies' section of the catalogue of the British Museum. There is plainly a purpose, then, in gathering together some matters of record and speculation suggested by these two names, if only to emphasize the fact of their distinct applications. There is also special point in a historical inquiry into the meaning of the two names, since each has been regarded from time to time as standing for an actual literary club or organization of some kind in a period when organized literary study, either vocational or amateur, was probably quite outside the order of the day. Still another justification for our inquiry lies in the fact that the 'Athenian Virtuosi,' whose publications furnished an episode among Dryden's critical quarrels, has been the object of some degree of historical error, and that the 'Athenian Society,' an early English journalistic enterprise of no small merit, and at times of no little literary impressiveness, is in spite of its interesting associations still practically unknown save by name.

The causes of the frequent confusion of these two so-called societies may be traced in all probability to the lack of historical facts pertaining to each; but this confusion may have been increased by some coincidental similarities of name in the publications relating to their separate histories. This can be illustrated specifically without anticipating too many of the points in the history of the two assumed organizations. Richard Leigh's *Censure of the Rota*, for example, published in 1673, purports to record the debate at a meeting of the Athenian Virtuosi 'in the Coffe-Academy instituted by Apollo for the advancement of Gazette Philosophy, Mercury's Diurnals &c.' Here we are by pure

accident reminded that the Athenian Society in 1691 met in the Apollo Coffee-House, and published the *Athenian Gazette*, afterwards called the *Athenian Mercury*. In addition to this, the dedicatory preface to the *History of the Athenian Society*, 1691, is signed by the initials R. L., ostensibly those of the author. These are, of course, the initials of Richard Leigh, whom Anthony à Wood names as the author of the *Censure of the Rota*; but here again we have a pure coincidence, for the author of the *History* was practically without doubt Charles Gildon, and the initials are not, then, those of the author.

My remarks have assumed a doubt as to the actual existence of the two societies, but for the present, for the sake of verbal economy, I shall use the two names simply as names, whatever they may stand for, whether they represented societies or not.

The tangible facts which show that the two societies were unquestionably distinct and unrelated can be indicated very briefly. John Dunton is admitted upon his own evidence and that of Gildon to have founded the Athenian Society in 1691. All the publications of or referring to the Athenian Virtuosi are of the year 1673. Dunton makes no reference to the Athenian Virtuosi, nor is he mentioned in publications relating to them. There is no possible connection between the historical data relating to the two societies. Finally, Dunton tells us that he was born in 1659; he would therefore have been fourteen years old at the time of the presumed existence of the Athenian Virtuosi, a society sitting in judgment upon a play of Dryden's. The separate identities of the two societies are, therefore, beyond question.

The Athenian Virtuosi.

There are four publications directly pertaining to the Athenian Virtuosi, all of them issued in 1673. The first of these is a critical pamphlet which Anthony à Wood ascribes to Richard Leigh[1], *The Censure of the Rota on Mr Dryden's Conquest of Granada*[2]. The work was followed immediately by another pamphlet attack upon Dryden in the guise of a defence of the poet against the *Censure of the Rota* itself —*The Friendly Vindication of Mr Dryden*[3]. Dryden in his reply to these two pamphlets aptly alludes to their authors as 'Fastidious Brisk

[1] *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss, 5 vols., 1813—20, vol. iv, col. 533.

[2] [Richard Leigh], *The Censure of the Rota on Mr Driden's Conquest of Granada*, Oxford, 1673.

[3] *The friendly vindication of Mr Dryden from the Censure of the Rota by his cabal of wits*, Cambridge, 1673.

of Oxford,' and 'Fungoso in the play, who follows the fashion at a distance'[1], indicating clearly the authors of the first and second publications respectively. In spite of the fact that Wood ascribes the first work definitely to Leigh, Malone tentatively assigns the appellation 'Fastidious Brisk of Oxford' to Martin Clifford, Master of the Charterhouse, and one of the collaborators in the *Rehearsal*, though Clifford was from Cambridge, and Leigh from Oxford[2]. The phrase, however, may clearly refer to the place of publication, since it is scarcely possible to assume that Dryden must have known the author of the pamphlet. Malone's assumption that Clifford was the author of any one of the *Rota* pamphlets, or connected directly with the *Rota* controversy, is probably occasioned by the misreading of a remark of Gerard Langbaine's. In applying to Dryden's own work some of his criticisms of earlier playwrights, Langbaine concludes: 'Mr Dryden having already been arraign'd before the Wits upon the Evidence of the Rota, and found Guilty by Mr Clifford, the Foreman of the Jury, I shall suppress my further Evidence, till I am serv'd with a Subpoena by him to appear before that Court, or have an Action clapp'd upon me by his Proctor, as guilty of a Scandalum Archi-Poetae, and then I shall readily give in my Depositions'[3]. It will be seen that in this passage there is no implication that Clifford was the author of the *Censure of the Rota*, for looking carefully into the value of Langbaine's figure, we see that Clifford is represented as delivering a verdict *based upon* 'the evidence of the Rota.' This seems to relieve him explicitly of the authorship of the book or of any connection with it. In Johnson's life of Dryden[4], however, we find a paragraph or two which conveys a rational explanation of Langbaine's allusion (though without specific reference to Langbaine's remark). Johnson refers to Clifford's strictures on the play as conveyed in the four probably contemporary letters to Dryden—two of which he quotes in part—which were eventually printed some years later in a pamphlet now very rarely met with[5]. This explanation complies wholly with the substance and figurative suggestion of Langbaine's criticism, and obviates the necessity of discrediting Wood's evidence and drawing Clifford into another quarrel

[1] John Dryden, *Works*...ed. Scott and Saintsbury, 18 vols., Edinburgh, 1882—93, IV, 376.

[2] John Dryden, *Critical and miscellaneous prose works...Collected with notes and...life ...by Edmond Malone*, 3 vols. in 4, London, 1800, vol. I, Pt. 2, pp. 377—8.

[3] Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English dramatic poets*...Oxford, 1691, 151.

[4] Samuel Johnson, *Works*...Oxford, 1825, vol. VII, pp. 259—60.

[5] Martin Clifford, *Notes on Mr Dryden's Poems, in four letters...to which are annexed some reflections upon the Hind and the Panther by another hand*, London, 1687.

with Dryden in which there is no reason to assume that he felt any immediate interest.

As to the *Censure of the Rota* itself, the work presents a fabric of particularist criticism upon the *Conquest of Granada*, dealing principally with questions of diction and of the consistency of the plan and treatment of the play with Dryden's own published criticism. It is, in fact, little more than an elaborate and pedantical piece of fault-finding. From its manner one is inclined to agree with Dryden in imputing its motives largely to personal malice.

The Friendly Vindication of Mr Dryden was, like the rest of the pamphlets in the controversy, issued anonymously. Its author is not known. The piece is only ostensibly, of course, a vindication of the dramatist, and all its force is borrowed from the *Censure*. The *Friendly Vindication* represents Dryden in the midst of his literary friends discussing the criticisms of the earlier pamphlet. In a peevishly injured tone he brings up the points upon which he has been assailed and talks them over with his companions, who, while flattering him into complacency, quietly pass among themselves insinuations as to the justice of the criticisms, with a good deal of private laughter at his expense. This tract ends provocatively: '*Finis* or not *finis*, as Mr Dryden pleaseth.' Dryden's brief rejoinder is found in the dedication to the *Assignation*, which is addressed to Sir Charles Sedley; in this he deals rather overseriously with the personal nature of the attack upon him, though his position is on the whole dignified[1]. This is Dryden's only allusion to the entire controversy.

Malone assumes, and his assumption has not been questioned by Sir Walter Scott and Mr Saintsbury, that Dryden's reply was addressed not only to the authors of the *Censure of the Rota* and the *Friendly Vindication*, but to the author of a third tract, *A Description of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuosi*[2]. All the editors of Dryden have regarded this work as a continuation of the attack begun by Leigh and followed up in the *Friendly Vindication*. It seems really open to question, however, whether the pamphlet is not a *bona-fide* defence of Dryden's position. The book is said by Scott to possess the same 'frothy, flippant style of raillery' as the *Censure* itself[3]; but while there is no question that this characterization might very well apply to the

[1] *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, vol. IV, pp. 369—77.

[2] *A Description of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuosi: with a discourse held there in vindication of Mr Dryden's Conquest of Granada; against the authour of the Censure of the Rota*, London, 1673.

[3] John Dryden, *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, vol. I, p. 133.

Friendly Vindication, a thoroughly careful reading and re-reading of the *Description of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuosi* has induced me to believe that the book, if not in fact a purposed defence of Dryden, is in any event sufficiently impartial to constitute an answer to the meticulous and frivolous personalities of the first two publications. As far as I can see, valid points of objection are raised and sustained in this pamphlet against the injustices of the *Censure* and the *Friendly Vindication*. The tone of the book in this respect is not at all that of the other two; this is indeed so strikingly the case that, far from resembling in style the *Censure* itself, it is sufficiently different from it to condemn for this reason alone Scott's surmise that the two may have been written by the same author[1]. Disagreement on these questions with so distinguished a group of scholars as have dealt with this point may seem less dangerous in view of the proverbial risks of the ironic form. The two-edged sword has smitten others than Defoe and Swift—and this work is certainly one of two things: either a frank vindication, or a bit of irony very badly overdone. My own opinion is, I repeat, that the pamphlet is just what its title declares it to be.

Of the three pamphlets mentioned above, the second two were of course subsequent to the first one, but the relative times of their appearance are unknown and unimportant. A fourth pamphlet appeared in the controversy, however, which was designed as a sincere defence of Dryden in answer to the *Friendly Vindication*. This last pamphlet, the authorship of which is assigned to Charles Blount[2], is *Mr Dreyden vindicated, in a reply to the Friendly Vindication*[3]. It is important simply as the closing publication of the controversy, a sincere work, but a feeble one. It purports to deal specifically with the actual criticisms of the *Friendly Vindication*, but offers little more than accusations of plagiarism on the part of the author of the *Friendly Vindication*. Its replies to the particular points of criticism in the first two pamphlets are very lame indeed.

As to the underlying problem, whether the Athenian Virtuosi represented an actual society of literary amateurs, there is no clear reason to differ from the beliefs reflected in the historical treatment of the subject among all of Dryden's biographers, that the Rota controversy was a quarrel simply of persons, and that the club name was

[1] John Dryden, *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, vol. I, p. 133.
[2] *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. V, p. 243.
[3] *Mr Dreyden vindicated, in a reply to the Friendly Vindication of Mr Dreyden, with reflections on the Rota*, London, 1673.

assumed merely as a veil for the attack, or for the ends of authority and prestige. The name 'Rota' is in all probability borrowed from James Harrington's 'coffee-club' of that title, of which Pepys was a member[1]. It is, of course, possible that the appropriated name may have covered the identities of actual foregatherers at a coffee-house; but the entire absence of collective variety in the method of attack seems to show clearly that the *Censure* itself scarcely represents the cursory judgments of a group of informal critics. Evidence of some finality lies in Wood's ascription of the *Censure* to an individual author, and in the reference of the title-page of the *Description of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuosi* to 'the authour of the *Censure of the Rota.*'

The Athenian Society.

In the Athenian Society we have a question of a different kind. This society was unquestionably organized, and was possibly chartered[2]. Its contact with life and affairs was extensive and, in great degree, commendable. It had as patron Sir William Temple; as contributor, Swift; as panegyrist, Defoe; and its historian was the unillustrious Charles Gildon. It earned also the possible honour of having its aims and methods burlesqued in a comedy by the City Poet, Elkanah Settle. The published work of the Athenian Society is well known as an early venture in journalism, and a competent reflection of contemporary life; the society contributed extensively to the popularization of science and philosophy in its time; and the final proof of its surviving interest is found in the fact that two abridged reprints of its most popular publication were issued in the nineteenth century. In the present case the question of the validity of the society's claim to the name of 'learned society' depends upon the meaning that they themselves attached to the name, or upon their good faith in attaching to the name whatever meaning they wished it to convey. Despite the relatively great importance of the organization and its valuable literary connections, all historical evidence regarding it seems to point to the conclusion that it was not, after all, a *bona-fide* society of amateur aims.

The materials for the history of this society are derived principally from two sources, *The History of the Athenian Society*, 1691, written

[1] *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*...Edited...by Henry B. Wheatley, 9 vols., London, 1893—9, vol. I, pp. 14 n., 20, 59.

[2] [Elkanah Settle], *The New Athenian Comedy, containing the politicks, oeconomicks, tacticks...of that most learned society*, London, 1693, 3.

without doubt by Charles Gildon[1], and John Dunton's *Life and Errors*, 1705[2].

Throughout the entire history of the society the name of Dunton is pre-eminent. Dunton tells us that the scheme of the society came to his mind when he was in grave perplexity as to a course of action to pursue in a case of personal trouble; he was greatly in need of advice, yet unwilling to submit the occasion of his trouble to the knowledge of those who might aid him. His difficulty brought to his mind the admirable plan of instituting as a commercial venture a publication which might have been of value to him in his uncertainty—a journal devoted to answering the questions of anonymous inquirers. This periodical he eventually established, enlisting in his service two capable assistants. The three writers assumed the name of 'The Athenian Society,' deriving it from the title which they had already agreed upon for their publication, *The Athenian Gazette*. The three original members of the society were, then, Dunton himself, the Rev. Samuel Wesley, father of the founder of the Methodist Church, and Dr Richard Sault, a Cambridge mathematician of high repute. Sault afterwards secured the occasional aid of Dr John Norris; but Norris refused the opportunity of becoming a regular member of the society[3].

The first number of the *Athenian Gazette* appeared March 17, 1690/1[4]. The society had advertised the scheme until sufficient popular interest was excited to provide material for a few numbers; and with the publication of the first copies success was assured. The second number of the *Gazette* changed the title to *Athenian Mercury*, but the title-pages to the whole volumes retained throughout the title *Athenian Gazette or Casuisticall Mercury*[5]. Nineteen volumes of the *Gazette* were completed, and it was announced that after the completion of the twentieth volume the subsequent volumes would be issued

[1] *The history of the Athenian Society for resolving all nice and curious questions. By a gentleman who got secret intelligence of their whole proceedings*...London [1691].

[2] *The life and errors of John Dunton, written by himself in solitude...Together with the lives and characters of a thousand persons now living in London*, London, 1705.

[3] Dunton's *Life and errors*, pp. 248—250.

[4] *The Athenian Gazette: or Casuisticall Mercury, resolving all the most nice and curious questions proposed by the ingenious*, 20 vols., London, 1691—7.

[5] There were thirty numbers of the *Gazette* to a volume, with a supplement to volume v consisting of answers to questions for which there was no room in the regular numbers. In this supplement, pages 1—6, appeared an ode and a letter from Jonathan Swift; the ode was one of the three poems that called forth Dryden's damning criticism of Swift's verse. Every fifth volume of the *Gazette*, it was announced, was to contain a supplement similar to that of the fifth volume; but no other supplements actually appeared. It was also intended that every fifth volume should have an alphabetical table of contents; but this, also, appeared only in vol. v. The single numbers of the *Gazette* were printed on both sides of a folio sheet, and paged successively throughout each volume.

quarterly, instead of in single sheet numbers. Only ten numbers of the twentieth volume were issued, however, the last appearing June 14th, 1697. As volume XX was not completed, it has, of course, no title-page. The reason for the sudden discontinuance of the *Gazette* is not wholly clear. It was read with eagerness to the last, and Dunton tells us many years later that the society had an enormous amount of unanswered queries, sufficient, indeed, to suggest to him the possibility of printing the answers to this material in an entirely new publication to extend to several volumes. Dunton himself suggests facts that probably explain at least in part the discontinuance of the publication. In the first place, he complains that the query plan was liberally borrowed from the very moment of its first appearance in the *Gazette*; and again, he tells us that the great number of the readers of the paper were not themselves subscribers, but used the copies that were readily obtained in the coffee-houses.

In the unpaged table of contents to volume V, under the index-word 'History,' is found the statement that a history of the Athenian Society should be found prefixed to the first volume. In the Burney copy of the *Gazette* in the British Museum this is the case, but many copies of the *Gazette* are found without the *History*, and the *History* itself is generally seen detached. This volume, which appeared anonymously, has its own title-page and pagination. The Epistle Dedicatory, addressed to the Athenian Society, is signed R. L.; this is followed by commendatory poems by Tate, Motteux, Richardson, Defoe, and an unknown hand. The *History* opens with a modest regret that so worthy a society should lack a Sprat for its historian. In the author's expansion upon the personnel and objects of the society, we are informed that its merits alone had induced the author to attempt its history, and that in seeking facts for the purpose he would have been utterly lost in his generous design because of the modesty of the members, were it not that a certain C. B., assumedly one of the members of the society, imparted the information that the writer wished, under the pledge that the informant's identity should be kept secret. At the end of the *History* is appended a commendatory letter from C. B. upon the completion of the *History*, together with a deprecatory letter over the initials of Richard Sault expressing regret that the author had chosen to make so much of his small merits. Disingenuous as most of this sounds, Sault's letter has a note of unquestioned sincerity; and with good reason, for the *History* is a panegyric sufficiently unblushing to rouse the modesty of any of the three members with whom it particularly

deals. The historical facts are few and tenuous. The society is referred to as a 'learned society,' and a comparison with the province of the Royal Society's labour is invited in the reference to Sprat's *History of the Royal Society*. In addition to the characters of the three original members and of Dr Norris, the *History of the Athenian Society* refers to eight other members, who, the historian says, 'afford so ample and so just a Theme of Praise, that nothing but my Ignorance of them, can hinder me from giving the World a more particular knowledg of them.'

This question of the number and identity of the other members of the society is a puzzling one. The author of the *History*, as we have seen, admits that he can throw no light upon it, and all sources of information on the subject that are offered by the society or its members are unsatisfactory, and, I believe, in large part intentionally deceiving. The existence of C. B., the writer's informant, would naturally lead us to assume that there was at least one other member whose separate identity might be established, but, as I shall point out more specifically later, Dunton himself was in all probability the one who communicated the facts of the society's history to Gildon, the author. So we are brought back to the three original members.

Dunton makes a number of conflicting statements in regard to the membership of the society. In the preface to the first volume of the *Gazette*, after referring to the difficulty of carrying on the query project with only one assistant (for we are told by Dunton that the first two *Gazettes* were written by himself and Sault unaided[1]) the writer continues: 'This inconvenience we have now taken care to remedy; and as we gave the Publick notice in some former Advertisements, engaged such Persons in the affair, that what would have been *impar onus* to any one or two, may now be dispatched with much more ease and accuracy.' Since, again, as I shall point out later, Dunton was in reality responsible for the statements of Gildon's *History of the Athenian Society*, we can take it for his own assertion that the society in 1691 numbered eleven members. In addition to this, testimony as to the number of members in the society is offered in the *Young Students Library*[2], which the society published in 1692, in the engraved frontispiece of which there were represented the members, twelve in number, seated before a table. A diaphanous curtain lowered before their faces, however, effectually baffles any attempt at identification of the majority

[1] *Life and Errors*, pp. 249—50.

[2] *The Young-Students-Library, containing, extracts and abridgments of the most valuable books printed in England, and in the forreign journals, from the year sixty-five, to this time* ...London, 1692.

of them. Dunton seems to be recognizable by his position in the centre of the group and by his beard, and Wesley by his clerical dress. The crude verses beneath the plate point out that the picture represents the membership of the society. In Dunton's *Life and Errors*, on the other hand, which was written, we may remember, eight years after the *Gazette* had ceased to exist, we find an absolute contradiction of all Dunton's previous statements and intimations. After referring to the accession of Wesley as the third member of the society, he says: 'With this new addition we found ourselves to be masters of the whole design, and thereupon we neither lessen'd nor increas'd our number[1].' But evidence as to the falsity of the society's pretensions on this point is found even during its actual existence. In the 'Preface to the Reader' of Elkanah Settle's *New Athenian Comedy*, published in 1693, Settle refers, with sublime indifference to grammatical structure, to the frontispiece to the *Young Students Library*: ''Tis true our generous Athenians have lately vouchsafed to give us some small lineaments of theirs in miniature...But there alas, they are pleased to wrap their faces in Mosaic Veils, very magisterially intimating that they are persons that daily converse so near with Divinity, that their shining faces are too dazling for humane View, and therefore no less kindly than modestly, thus like Bays his Morning pictur'd in a Cloud. I confess Mr Engraver has made a pretty Jolly Company of 'em: but there indeed the painter is a little too poetical; and our Athenians have a little strained a point: for when the true Muster Roll of that not overnumerous Society shall be examined, for the supply of that defect, you must consider that the Veil'd Faces are by way of Faggots to fill up the Troop: and in that fair Convention of divine Enthusiasts you must not take 'em all for the Boanerges of Wit, the Organs of Thunder, but like Guns in a Fireship, a Tire of painted wooden Tools to make up the Show.' For whatever reason, therefore, the society thought it advisable to pretend to fictitious numbers, there is no reason to doubt Dunton's final statement, made while the society was no longer prominently before the public, that at least during the publication of the *Gazette* there were three members only.

Eventually, however, the society did increase its numbers; but this was after the *Gazette* had ceased publication, and when Dunton himself was the sole surviving member. Dunton wished to revive the query plan again, making use in part of the material left over when the *Gazette* was abandoned. In the meantime Sault had died, Dr Norris

[1] *Life and Errors*, p. 256.

had written a sharp reply to the Athenians' comments upon his criticism of Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding*[1], and from many acerbitous allusions to Wesley, it is evident that Dunton had quarrelled with the last of his three original collaborators[2]. It was necessary, therefore, for Dunton to enlist an entirely new corps of workers. This he did, calling the revived society New Athens. In referring to the reorganized society he says: 'Our Triumvirate is not only supply'd, but the number increas'd by a new election of Nine Members, all masters in their several faculties, so that the World shall shortly hear from New Athens, in a supplementary way to the performances of the old[3].' The dedication to the Athenian Spy, 1709[4], also shows that the New Athenians were more numerous than their predecessors, adding a fact of incidental interest, that 'the most Pindarick lady,' in all probability Mrs Elizabeth Singer Rowe, had been asked, and had refused, to become one of the new number. Dunton's plan to produce a continuation of the *Gazette* took form in the publication of the *Athenian Oracle*[5]. This was in part a reprint and in part a continuation of the *Gazette* material. Its extracts from the *Gazette* were judicious and representative; so it is in reality more consistently entertaining than the *Gazette* itself.

It will have been seen in the last few paragraphs that the most noteworthy single fact in the history of the society is the pre-eminence of Dunton from beginning to end. In Settle's *New Athenian Comedy* he is represented as presiding at the meetings of the society. In all of his works in which he refers to the society, he alludes to himself as the organizer and conductor of the project. But his less guarded references reveal still more; for although he tried to establish a popular belief in the amateur and elective status of the society, we find him to have held a personal relation to it which must dismiss any doubt as to the true plan and motives of the organization. Gildon's *History* is plainly intended to convey the impression that the aims of the society were philanthropic and instructive, and Gildon himself asserts that he

[1] John Norris, *Christian Blessedness: or discourses upon the Beatitudes...To which are added, Reflections upon a late Essay concerning Human Understanding: with a reply to the remarks made upon them by the Athenian Society*, 2nd ed., London, 1692, pp. 45—65.

[2] *Life and Errors*, passim, and *Athenian Sport: or, two thousand paradoxes merrily argued...by a member of the Athenian Society* [John Dunton], London, 1707, passim.

[3] *Life and Errors*, pp. 261—2.

[4] *The Athenian Spy: discovering the secret letters which were sent to the Athenian Society by several ingenious ladies, relating to the management of their affections. Being a complete system of love cases...*2nd ed., London, 1709.

[5] *The Athenian Oracle: being an entire collection of all the valuable questions and answers in the old Athenian Mercuries. Intermixed with many cases...never before published...*4 vols., London, 1703—10. (Vol. 4 contains a reprint of Gildon's *History of the Athenian Society*. New editions of the *Oracle* were published in 1820 and 1892.)

undertook the *History* upon his own initiative and solely because of the merits of the society's project. Dunton, when he tells us that Gildon wrote the *History*, says simply that 'Mr Gildon thought it worth his while' to write the work[1]. But in recording his personal impression of Gildon he says: 'He [Gildon] was always very just in the Engagements where I had any concern, and his Performances were done, as well as the Designs would admit. He writ the History of the Athenian Society, which contain'd the just Merits of that Cause[2]'; this is apparently a clear implication that the writing of the *History* was an 'engagement' in which Dunton had some concern. Again, in writing the character of Defoe, Dunton says with a passing allusion to the hard necessity which kept Defoe at his hack-work—and which Dunton himself felt continually in the latter part of his career—'Mr Foe writ for me the Character of Dr Annesley and a Pindarick in Honour of the Athenian Society which was prefix'd to the History of it, and he might have ask'd me the Question before he had inserted either of 'em in the Collection of his Works, in Regard, he writes so bitterly against the same Injustice in others[3].' Again, although we find the Epistle Dedicatory to Gildon's *History* signed with the initials R. L., there is strong reason for the assumption that Dunton himself wrote this dedication, as he appropriates *verbatim* a long passage from it in his own dedication to *Athenianism*, 1710[4]. Furthermore, in the reprint of the *History* in the fourth volume of the *Athenian Oracle* Dunton edits the history liberally, and often significantly. This evidence seems, cumulatively, to establish the fact that the society's reticence toward's Gildon's undertaking was merely assumed—that, in fact, it was at Dunton's instance that Gildon wrote the *History*, for the purpose of advertising the society, and that Dunton regarded the work as his own literary property, to be used as he saw fit for the furtherance of his projects.

These facts and deductions seem to warrant the opinion that in a large part of the society's transactions Dunton alone stood as the responsible officer; and this conclusion is supported by a quantity of evidence from the same and similar sources. In the first place, shortly after the appearance of the *Gazette*, action was brought against the society, apparently by the proprietors of a journal of similar title. It

[1] *Life and Errors*, p. 258.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 241.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 239—40.
[4] *Athenianism: or the new projects of Mr John Dunton,...being six hundred distinct treatises...and is an entire collection of all his writings*...Vol. I,...London, 1710.

was evidently for this reason that the title *Athenian Gazette* was changed to *Athenian Mercury.* From Settle's reference to the matter we learn that the society secured at the same time some sort of governmental protection, probably incorporation, to warrant their continued use of the new title. In alluding to this transaction, Settle indicates that Dunton himself had paid the costs of it—thirty guineas[1]. This fact supports the probability that Dunton was not only the founder and leader of the society, but also its financial factor, a probability further emphasized by his constant allusion to the society as 'my project,' a phrase which was applied to all of his financial ventures. We infer, too, from Dunton's mention of the early Athenians that it was he personally who enlisted the services of Wesley and Sault after he had found himself unable to command the entire project single-handed[2]. Our surmises on this point are supported also by references to his connection with the New Athenians. In mentioning the publication of the *Oracle,* he tells us that he personally sold the publisher's rights to 'Mr Bell of Cornhill[3]'; and later, in the 'character' of Mr Bell, we see that Dunton regarded it as a personal grievance that Bell had in some way presumed upon his privileges as purchaser. Referring again to the *Oracle* project he says: 'If my Honored Mother (Madame Jane Nicholas) will be so kind, as to lend me Two Hundred Pound, to carry on this New-Oracle, I doubt not by Christmas next...to pay all I owe to the World[4].' These references establish with certainty Dunton's financial responsibility for the society; the final piece of evidence as to the extent of his connection with the society is found, however, in the Dedicatory Preface to *Athenianism,* published in 1710. Here, addressing the society, he congratulates himself on 'being Honour'd so far as to be chosen and continu'd a Member of your Society,' endeavouring here to sustain his old deception as to the elective nature of the society. But with his curiously thoughtless but characteristic inadvertency, in the same preface he proposes the publication of a weekly paper, the *Athenian News, or Dunton's Apollo, containing Twenty distinct Posts,* regarding which he says: 'If I find the Twenty Posts too many to gallop through Dunton's quill, I shall Press a TROOP of New Athenians, which I'll call—Number Twenty—and will oblige every one of these Listed Authors to affix his Name to his own Post[5].'

[1] *The New Athenian Comedy*, p. 3.
[2] *Life and Errors*, pp. 248—250.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 261—2.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 263.
[5] *Athenianism*, 1710, Dedicatory Preface.

This passage indicates Dunton's relation to the society to have been nothing less than absolute proprietorship.

To close the question, then, there can be little doubt as to the exact status of the Athenian Society; it was an organization varying in the number of its members according to the scope of the work which it had in hand, founded by Dunton and constantly referred to as one of his 'projects,' and apparently wholly under his rule as its promoter and the owner of its name and rights. Gildon's claim for it of the title 'learned society' is therefore seen to be wholly invalid, for the society was organized and conducted for purely commercial purposes, its members constantly changing according to the proprietor's personal judgments as to their efficiency as collaborators. The society was, in short, simply an editorial staff, working under the name of 'learned society' for the sake of its prestige.

Dismissing the justice of the claims to special interest implied in the titles 'Athenian Virtuosi' and 'Athenian Society' does not necessarily force us to a definite position on the question as to the existence of literary societies in this period. However, the fact that we can concede no importance in this respect to either of the groups with which we have dealt recalls the general belief—probably a correct one—that there was not, up to this time in England, a scholarly or amateur society concerned primarily with literature in its objective aspect. Such organizations and projects as the Areopagus, Parker's Society of Antiquaries, Bolton's Academy, Jeremy Taylor's Society of Friendship, the Royal Society Committee, may all have possessed functional or incidental literary interests; but it is probably a mistake to assume the existence of any institution of the type of our modern literary societies, for the reason that these owe their own existence to an essentially modern conception of literature as an object of scholarship—a conception which was scarcely defined before the middle of the eighteenth century.

HARRISON ROSS STEEVES.

NEW YORK.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

'Piers Plowman,' One or Five.

Prof. Manly put in the forefront of his case the *a priori* objection that 'lines 236—41 [of Passus V] are entirely out of harmony with [Sloth's] character,' since they treat of the restitution of ill-gotten gains. Dr Bradley spoke equally strongly of 'the incredible conclusion that the A-man forgot to mention one of the seven deadly sins, and represented Sloth as promising restitution of fraudulent gains'; though M. Jusserand's arguments on the first point, and Mr Chambers' on the second, seem now to have reconciled him to the possibility of accepting these six lines where we find them. But it seems hitherto to have escaped notice that the author of the so-called 'Wycliffite adaptation' of Archbishop Thoresby's catechism, who was very probably an actual contemporary of the A-man, gives us a case exactly in point. (*Lay Folk's Catechism*, E. E. T. S. No. 118, p. 93, l. 1352, punctuated to make the meaning plain.)

> The fyfte dedly synne ys Couetyse; þat is, a wrongwys ȝernynge
> to haue any maner good þat vs owyþ not;
> and þis is pryncipaly don on two wyses:
> On is, wrongfully to gete ony þyng....
> Anoþer is, wrongfully to holde:
> þat is, whan we wil not do to god almyȝty,
> ne to holy chirche, ne to oure euyn-cristyn,
> þat us owe to do be dette and be lawe,
> but only holde þat we haue to oure owne ese,
> not only we synne in Couetyse but also in slewþe;
> and not only he þat wrongfully getys,
> but also he þat wrongfully holdys, fallys in þat synne.

When we find this popular theologian so clearly explaining how 'he that wrongfully holds' comes under the sin of Sloth, why need we quarrel with the A-man for making Sloth say

> And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn. ȝif I so muche haue,
> Al that I wikkedliche won, seththe I wit hade?

It may be also worth while to indicate here the remarkable parallelism between *Lay Folk's Catechism*, p. 57, 877 ff. (cf. 82, 1225 ff.) and *Piers Plowman* A. VIII. 160 ff. on the subject of indulgences and good works; though this may not be pertinent to the question of authorship.

G. G. COULTON.

CAMBRIDGE.

STAGE-ARRANGEMENT IN PEELE'S 'DAVID AND BETHSABE,' I. i.

At the beginning of Peele's *David and Bethsabe*, the speaker of the prologue '*draws a curtain and discovers* Bethsabe, *with her maid, bathing over a spring: she sings, and* David *sits above viewing her.*' The words of Bethsabe show that she is sitting in a sunproof grove or arbour. She is evidently on the lower stage, the spring being under the gallery in which David sits. Exponents of Elizabethan stage arrangements have tried somewhat unconvincingly to explain the relative positions of the lady and her royal lover. In 'A catalogue of fine and valuable books,' recently issued by Messrs Joseph Baer & Co. of Frankfort-on-Main, p. 213, there is an illustration which may help to throw light on the subject. This is Beham's engraved title-page of Hieronymo Braunschweig's *Thesaurus Pauperum*, as published at Frankfort in 1537. In the upper part of the picture is a window or balcony at which sits David strumming at his harp, though his thoughts seem to have strayed from his music. The title of the book fills a panel which forms the wall immediately below the balcony. One cannot see how this wall is supported, but in the recess beneath it is an ornamental fountain, about which grow shrubs and trees. Before the fountain, and apparently just beyond the shelter of the balcony, sits Bethsabe with her skirt drawn above her knees, her feet in a basin. Four maids attend upon her, one of whom washes her feet, while the others stand by with the appurtenances of the bath—pitcher and soap (?), towel, and comb (?); and 'David *sits above viewing her*'—not that he can see much of her face, but he seems interested in her fair fat legs. It may be objected that the lady is not bathing 'over' the fountain, and that, if she were, even her legs would not be visible to the monarch at his window. But the stage-direction may mean no more than that she is not having a bath *in* the spring. Of course the picture

is earlier than the Elizabethan age, and it is not English, but its intention is quite clear, and a sixteenth century audience might readily have accepted a similar conventional representation on the stage.

J. Le Gay Brereton.

Sydney.

Fielding's Choice of Signature for 'The Champion.'

One naturally asks, 'Why did Henry Fielding sign with a capital letter his essays in *The Champion* between November 1739 and June 1740? Why did he adopt the letters C and L, and only these? Why did he sign C up to and on March 1, 1740, and L on March 4 and in fifteen of his twenty-four later signed papers that concluded with the essay of June 12?'

These questions are perhaps partly answered by a paragraph in the C paper of March 1, the significance of which has not yet been pointed out. In this essay Fielding speaks at length of various devices that his bookseller has urged to give a 'name' or vogue to the periodical. He has proposed to declare that some of the papers are posthumous essays of Addison; that the writer was in Wales when Steele died; that he is lately come from Ireland;—or to throw in a hint about Lais's Wash (actually done in the issue of February 28); or to say that the writer lodged near Twickenham last summer; or to insinuate that Bolingbroke is author of the periodical, etc. Fielding says he 'scorned to impose false Colours on the World'; the papers should stand on their own merits; 'like some tender Parents, I had such a fondness for my Offspring, that I would not part with them to another even for their own Advantage';—and he concludes the essay with the paragraph to which I have referred: 'However, to pacify him, I was forced to condescend to agree, that in order to make my Paper appear like a *Spectator*, it should for the Future be adorned with a Capital Letter at the End, as well as a Motto at the Beginning.'

Each *Champion* essay has the motto at the beginning. Addison's signature in the *Spectator* was a capital letter out of the four C L I O. Up to and on March 1, the date of issue of the above paragraph, Fielding signed C; in the next paper (March 4) and in fifteen out of his twenty-four following papers up to and including June 12, he signed L. He never got farther, no other letters being used. If this paragraph is to be taken at all literally, we find in it explanation for

the fact that the essays in the first four issues of the *Champion* (those of November 15, 17, 20, 22) bear no signature, and that the signatures *are* employed in most of the issues thereafter—*i.e.* the original intention was to leave the essays unsigned. We may also see in this paragraph a desire of the writer to claim as his own the papers signed with letters, and a warning to his readers of the change impending from C to L: but perhaps this last is going a bit too far. It is of interest that the signature 'LILBOURNE,' ascribed to James Ralph, occurs first in the paper of April 10, after which date his earlier signature of two stars occurs only in the matter following the main essay of April 26. Perhaps the real reason for changing the signatures was a desire to afford variety, or for the moment to offer the impression of a variety of writers. The 'Advertisement' of the two-volume collected edition of 1741 carefully states that '*all the Papers distinguish'd with a C. or an L. are the Work of one Hand; those mark'd thus ** or sign'd* LILBOURNE, *of another,....*'

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

BELOIT, WISCONSIN, U.S.A.

TWO UNPUBLISHED POEMS OF W. S. LANDOR.

1. *To Lady Blessington.*

(Sent from Italy in a letter to H. C. Robinson, March 23, 1835.)

So then at last the Emperor Franz
With spindle shanks hath joined Death's Dance!
Prythee, good Saint Nepomucene,
Push the pale wretch behind the screen!
For if your Master's son should know,
He'd kick the trembler down below!
Then would the devil rave and rant
That Hell has more than Hell can want
Of such exceedingly good men,
And fork him to you back agen.

2. *The Four Willies.*

(In a letter to H. C. Robinson in May, 1835.)

Never was braver prince than he
Whom Normandy's prime chivalry
Followed across the narrow sea.
Nor aught less brave his bright-hair'd son
Whom Tyrrel's arrow pierced upon
The forest glade; nor less, that plague
Of poor old Louis from the Hague,
Who in French perrukes and French blood
Nine inches (half his stature) stood.

But braver than them all, one fourth
That bears the name: he from the north
Brought Howick: what can that man fear
Who fears not ruin when appear
Such swaggerers, arm'd with staves and stones
And links and brands for crazy thrones.
'Steddy, boys, steddy!' once he roar'd
And knuckled hard the festive board;
Now he is safely on dry land
Can he no longer sit or stand?
Must children in another age,
When catechized on History's page,
Be sugar-plum'd who rightly lisp,
'Dame! he was surnamed *Will o' th' Whisp.*'

These two poems are to be found in the unpublished correspondence of H. C. Robinson. (Dr Williams's Library, London.)

J. M. Carré.

Paris.

'Paindemaine.'

In the *New English Dictionary* the word *payndemayn* is derived from 'panis dominicus,' but no further explanation is given. The etymology may be illustrated from Petronius. In the *Satiricon* § 30, Encolpius and his friends have just begged the steward not to punish a slave who has lost the steward's clothes at the baths. The grateful slave comes up to Encolpius and says 'Ad summum statim scietis cui dederitis beneficium. Vinum dominicum ministratoris gratia est.'

We find frequent allusions in Latin literature to the host drinking wine which was superior to that which he gave his guests, e.g. Martial, iv. 85:

Nos bibimus vitro, tu murra, Pontice. Quare?
Prodat perspicuus ne duo vina calix.

We know that the same principle was extended to bread. Juvenal, v. 70, says:

Sed tener et niveus mollique siligine factus
Servatur domino.

(See Mayor's note on the passage.) Already then in the Latin of Petronius 'panis dominicus' would probably mean 'the master's special bread' and therefore 'a bread of a peculiar whiteness': cp. Chaucer, 'Sir Thopas':

Whyt was his face as payndemayn,
His lippes rede as rose.

R. F. Patterson.

Cambridge.

Hispanic 'alteru' and 'altu.'

In English, *l* is distinctly *u*-like, as compared with the ordinary French or German *l*; and in some cases a former *l* has become *u*: *hawk* rimes with *balk, chalk, stalk, talk.* In Serbian, *o* regularly replaces final *l*: *bio* = Bohemian *byl* 'been.' Dissimilation of *l...l* to *u...l* is fairly common in Semitic, as Arabic *tautal* 'waver' for *taltal*[1].

These developments show us that the change of Latin *l* to *u* is not abnormal in itself: Spanish *otro* = French *autre* = Neapolitan *àvotrə* < *alteru.* At the same time, Spanish *otro* seems strange beside *alto* < *altu.* Menéndez Pidal puts the latter among the words that 'se denuncian como posteriores en fecha, ó como semicultas[2].' Such a theory is hardly reasonable, for an every-day word like *alto*; we must consider both *alto* and *otro* normal, and try to explain their difference in some other way.

Dissimilation may be of three kinds: alterative, as in *alma* < *anima*; dislocative, as in *derretir*[3] < *deterere*; eliminative, as in *arado* < *aratru.* The formation of *alma* shows that the sounds affected need not be just the same. The consonants *l* and *r* are enough alike to produce elimination, as in *temblar* for **tremblar*, Rumanian *altul* < *alteru 'llu, pleoapă* < **palbepa* < *palpebra*[4]. We can therefore assume that Spanish *alto* is normal, and that **autro* was developed by dissimilation. The same alterant action of *r* is seen in *otero* < *altariu*; here the difference of stress allowed the connection with *alto* to be broken.

I have shown in *Modern Philology*, viii, 592, that the puzzling question of Spanish initial *y* and *j* can be solved by assuming for *ya* a dependence on stress, in accord with medial *ñ* and *nz*[5]; and by supposing that the rustic words *yugo* and *yunto* came from a dialect which kept *y* where Castilian developed *j.* Likewise we can assume that *salto* 'jump' is a town-word, while *soto* < *saltu* 'wood' represents a rustic dialect that had a stronger tendency to change *l* to *u.*

The Spanish development of *u* from *l* is found mainly before voiceless occlusives, or their derivatives. In *escoplo* for **escopro* < *scalpru*, or from **scalplu* formed by the influence of *scalpellu* on *scalpru*, dissimilation is visible, as in *otro.* The same reason probably explains *popar* < *palpare*, for the possible influence of the ending in changing a verb-stem

[1] Růžička, *Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen*, 42, Leipzig 1909.
[2] *Gramática histórica española*, § 9, Madrid 1905.
[3] *Revista lusitana*, xiii, 372.
[4] *Romanic Review*, i, 430.
[5] Menéndez Pidal, *Gramática histórica española*, § 47, Madrid 1905.

is proved by Italian *chiedere* < *quaerere*. The word *topo* is presumably rustic like *soto*.

Dental *n* has replaced velar *n* in *santo* < *sanctu* and *m* in *senda* < *semita*, so that we might expect the *l* of *calce* and *falce* to become palatalized (and later dental again). But this tendency towards an *i*-like sound was opposed to the general tendency of *l* to become *u*-like before a consonant. The latter was the stronger, and being exaggerated to balance the contrary palatal influence, it produced *coz* < **cauce*, *hoz* < **fauce*. The same development of *l* was repeated at a later date in *cauce* < *calice*, *sauce* < *salice*. If the variants *caz* and *saz* belong to the same dialect, they may be taken to show that *u*-like *l* was then becoming less general. In *alzar* the *l* has been protected by *alto*; moreover the sound that produced *ç* in *alçar* was probably always dental or alveolar, while the derivatives of *c* in *falce* and *salice* must have passed through palatal affricates similar to Swedish *tj* and Serbian *dj*.

When *l* followed *u*, the tendency to make the sound *u*-like yielded to the need of distinctness. This principle was so strong that it led to the other extreme, and *l* became *i*: *duz* < **doice* (= Galician *doce*) < *dulce*[1], *mucho* < **moito* (= Galician *moito*) < *multu*. A different evasion of the difficulty is seen in *surco* < *sulcu*, *urce* < *ulice*.

The derivation of *pujar* (= Portuguese *puxar*) from *pulsare* is considered improbable by Ford[2], on the ground that *falso* keeps *l*. Although this reasoning is accepted by Zauner[3], it is unsound. The *f* of *falso* makes the popular character of the word rather doubtful; but even if we assume a normal *l* in *falso*, it has nothing to do with the question of *pujar* coming from *pulsare*. Ford and Zauner overlook the fact that *l* before *t* has three derivatives in Spanish and Portuguese: *l*, *u* and *i*. Hence it is highly illogical to suppose that *ls* can have only one derivative. From the explanation of *mucho* given above, it is plain that *puxar* < **poisare* (with voiceless *s*) < *pulsare* is normal.

Portuguese generally agrees with Spanish in regard to the alteration of *l* to *u* or *i*. Catalan, on the other hand, not only keeps *l*, as *alt*, *altre*, *dols*, *molt*, but may even change *u* to *l*: *colze* < *cubitu*, *galta* < *gabata*, *malalt* < *male habitu*. This is especially remarkable, in view of the Catalan formation of *u* from other dentals: *veuréu* < *videre habetis*.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

[1] *Modern Philology*, VIII, 596.
[2] *Old Spanish Sibilants*, 121, Boston 1900.
[3] *Altspanisches Elementarbuch*, § 62, Heidelberg 1908.

REVIEWS.

The Old English Christian Epic. By George Arnold Smithson. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. I, No. 4.) 1910. 4to. 98 pp.

Mr Smithson states his method of attack with refreshing naïveté. He summarizes the historical and literary evidence of Latin scholarship among the English up to the end of the eighth century, and concludes 'when we examine the Latin prose of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and the Latin verse of Alcuin's *De Pontificibus* we become convinced that men like Cædmon and Cynewulf must have been impressed profoundly by Latin literature.' This very incautious reasoning leads to a correspondingly unscientific method of procedure; Mr Smithson first formed his 'conviction,' then—in vain—sought evidence in its support: 'when I came to look for evidence to prove my conviction that the form of the Cynewulfian poems was profoundly influenced by that of the Latin, I was forced to admit that that conviction, although it is a natural one, is in most respects a mistaken one.' The dissertation has therefore taken the form of a commentary on the plot-technique of the four poems named, each section concluding with a comparison between them and *Beowulf*, and a summary account of possible Latin influence.

Mr Smithson's chief conclusions may be summarized: 'Of all the methods of development by far the most important is direct discourse' —formal in *Elene*, formal but with some tendency to become dramatic in *Juliana*, distinctly more dramatic and more natural in *Andreas*. The characteristics of the technique of the Christian epics are explicable as natural developments of those of the earlier native epic, without Latin influence. 'The Old English poems were practically uninfluenced by the Vergilian epics'; but 'we find that the Latin prose legends of the saints confirmed the author or authors of the *Juliana*, the *Elene*, and the *Andreas* in the natural tendency to unify the plots of these poems and in the characteristic Old English tendency to digress from the main line of action; and that the Latin hymns and dramatic colloquies of the early church confirmed the author or authors in the tendency to increase the lyric and dramatic elements in these poems.'

The selection of material seems arbitrary. *Guðlac* is excluded, without explanation; though its two parts offer particularly interesting

illustration of the various treatment to which a saint's legend might be subjected. The Exeter Book *Harrowing of Hell* and the Cædmonian *Crist and Satan* are ignored, while *Crist* is included. Worse, Mr Smithson treats *Crist* as a whole, because it shows 'unity of tone,' and writes of it throughout as being in its entirety the work of Cynewulf. 'Differences in style may be due to copyists,' he observes in a footnote; and beyond this he does not even discuss the matter. Patriotic feeling may have urged Mr Smithson to follow Cook, but his attitude suggests ignorance of the work of Trautmann, Binz, and Holthausen, and of the dissertations on the subject during the last ten years. The punishment fits the crime; Mr Smithson is compelled to waste much space on the differences in technique between *Crist* and the other poems treated. Repeatedly he acknowledges lyrical tendencies in *Crist*. Frank recognition that it is composite, and that each of the three parts is a hymn-cycle, not an epic fragment, would have saved much vain labour. The assumption that *Andreas* is quite certainly the work of Cynewulf is also unwise; though the probability is strong enough for Mr Smithson's purpose.

Mr Smithson surveys his material from the standpoint of what epic should be, without allowing enough for the purpose of the poems in question. Of course he admits the intrusion of didactic purpose; but he does not recognize that didactic purpose was the poet's dominant motive, and that artistic considerations would quite deliberately be subordinated. *Juliana*, *Elene* and *Andreas* are not art-epics on Christian subjects, but didactic tales in verse, borrowing much of epic technique. Hence the repeated digressions in all the poems; certainly blots artistically, but perfectly natural to the type. Even the shifting of interest in *Elene* from Constantine to Elene, and finally to Judas, causes only an apparent breach of unity. The hero throughout is the Christian champion, though his person changes. The transfer of interest is less violent than that from Satan to Adam in *Paradise Lost*. Much of the detailed criticism similarly suffers through persistent application of the ideal epic standard. Every poem, surely, must be judged in regard to its author's purpose. That purpose may be criticized, and its effect on the work must be noted; but it is unprofitable to estimate achievement without regard to what is attempted.

The points at which Mr Smithson's detailed comments need modification are too numerous to mention in a brief review. In general, he does not make enough allowance for the influence, on the one hand of traditional phrase and of traditional epic technique; on the other hand, of the nature of the material. In dealing with *Andreas*, he does not recognize the deliberate imitation of *Beowulf*, noted by Brandl. The best section of the book is that dealing with methods of plot development (v), especially the interesting and valuable account of the use of dialogue. Except for this, Mr Smithson offers no new material of importance; but his minute investigation confirms current views on the main characteristics of the plot technique of the poems in question, and adds some interesting

details. The lists of references to illustrative passages in the poems are full, and, to judge from a score taken at random, accurate. Indeed the whole work shows very patient labour, and it is unfortunate that the results are in some degree vitiated through Mr Smithson's narrowness of outlook.

A. R. Skemp.

Bristol.

Robert Herrick, A Biographical and Critical Study. By F. W. Moorman. London: John Lane. 1910. 8vo. xiv + 344 pp.

In this comely volume Professor Moorman has turned a tempting opportunity to excellent account. He has recognised that the work of biographers, editors, and essayists during the last fifty years has prepared the way for a comprehensive study of Herrick's life and writings. He has supplemented the labours of his predecessors by researches of his own, and the result is a volume which, in spite of some curious inaccuracies, hereafter noted, is throughout worthy of its delightful theme.

The book is divided into two approximately equal parts, 'The Life' and 'The Works.' Anyone who will take the trouble to compare the biographical chapters with the similar section of Grosart's 'Memorial Introduction' to his edition of Herrick (1876) will note at once the difference between them. Though Grosart's valuable pioneer work must always be gratefully remembered he gives us little more than the raw material of biography. Dr Moorman attempts in a series of descriptive chapters dealing with the poet's life at Hampton, Cambridge, London and Dean-Prior to re-create the man and his surroundings. It is a fascinating game to play, and it is here carried through with spirit and skill. There are, however, two criticisms that may be made on Dr Moorman's biographical method. Except in the case of the letter belonging to Canon Egerton Leigh (pp. 37—8) he does not make it sufficiently clear where he is contributing new material discovered by himself, and where he is building upon older bases. Some additional foot-notes would have been a help here. And when filling in the background of the poet's life he at times gives his fancy too free rein. Thus while it is right to remind us that the boy was brought up after his father's death at Hampton, and 'therefore, though city-born, was country-bred'; and while it is legitimate to suggest that 'he may have caught sight of the old queen as she rode over Kingston Bridge' to or from Hampton Court in 1599, it is mere trifling to add that he 'perhaps saw something of the characteristic incident recorded by Lord Semple of Beltrees, the Scottish ambassador on this occasion,' and to quote in full the account of the incident (pp. 16—7). Again in reference to the performance of *Ignoramus* before James I at Cambridge in March, 1615, Dr Moorman says 'as a fellow-commoner of the University, Herrick was entitled to

a seat at the back of the hall during the performance, and we may be sure that he did not fail to be present' (p. 47). The last statement goes too far, apart from the fact that *Ignoramus*, though written by a fellow of Clare Hall, was not acted there (as Dr Moorman thinks) but at Trinity where the king was staying.

Another inaccuracy of an entirely different and much more surprising kind is found later in a quotation from the poem *To Dean Burn*. In well-known words Herrick bids farewell to its 'watry' (or in the modernised spelling of Mr Pollard's edition, 'watery') 'incivility.' Dr Moorman transforms 'watry' into 'warty' (p. 94), and that this is not merely a misprint is proved by the repetition of the misquotation on p. 133. It is difficult to understand how such a grotesque textual error should have been twice perpetrated.

Apart from such blemishes the biographical chapters are well-written and illuminating. Dr Moorman shows conclusively that the 'mistress-poems' cannot all be assigned to the period before Herrick's ordination. But he seeks to save the poet's reputation by advocating the view that the mistresses, including Julia, are nothing more than 'a poetic fiction.' It is a matter incapable of proof, one way or the other, but it is almost incredible that Herrick should have written about sixty poems to one mistress, many of them on definitely marked occasions or conveying special behests, if she had been merely a *nominis umbra*. In any case it is a startling transition from the atmosphere of the amours, real or fictitious, sung of in the *Hesperides*, to the matter-of-fact insinuation of 'Mr Dell's man' in 1640 that Herrick was the father of Thomasin Parsons' child (p. 118). There is no evidence in support of the truth of the charge (if it may so be called), but the discovery of the state-paper[1] containing it, which proves that Herrick must have resided for some time in London while he was vicar of Dean-Prior, demonstrates how imperfect our knowledge of his life is, and how baffling is the problem of the poet's personality, even when so able a biographer as Dr Moorman has done his best to interpret it.

Thus the second part of the volume, 'The Works,' is inevitably the more satisfying. The writer here throws his net wide, and the first chapter contains a searching discussion of the lyric of the English Renaissance' in its different aspects of the popular song, the art-lyric of Italian origin, the 'metaphysical' lyric introduced by Donne, and the classical lyric of Jonson and his school. The relation of Herrick's own lyrical poems to these various types of verse is then fully examined, as also to Jonson's Greek and Roman models. There is nothing more scholarly and suggestive in the volume than the discussion of the Caroline singer's debt to Anacreon, Catullus and Horace respectively. I only wish that Dr Moorman had gone still further, and had illustrated the 'frequent reminiscences' in the *Hesperides* 'of both the tragedies and the prose work of Seneca, as well as of the historical writings of Tacitus.' One does not naturally think of Tacitus and Herrick together,

[1] Apparently Dr Moorman is the first biographer of Herrick to quote this paper, but he does not indicate its *provenance*.

and I, for one, would be grateful if Dr Moorman would set forth in detail in the columns of this *Review* or elsewhere the debt of the *Hesperides* to the *Annals* or the *Histories*. In connection with Seneca it must be added that in a later chapter there is an extraordinary blunder. John Heywood is spoken of (p. 278) as the Senecan translator instead of his son Jasper. This mistake is all the more unfortunate as the elder Heywood is being referred to not as a writer of plays but of epigrams. Otherwise the whole discussion of the English epigram before Herrick, and of his own contributions to this poetic type, is admirable, and does justice to a side of his achievement that is commonly overlooked. Indeed it is the greatest merit of Dr Moorman's book that he recognises so fully the width and amplitude of Herrick's art. Thus of the *Welcome to Sack* he truly and finely says, 'It is not the utterance of some reveller, staggering homewards at dawn from some Eastcheap tavern, but that of a myrtle-garlanded priest of Iacchus, son of Zeus and Demeter, chanting his pæan of praise in the solemn Eleusinian mysteries.' Or again of the odes and elegies as a whole he notes that their elaborated style gives them 'a certain massiveness, a resonance, and an august, imperial splendour which place them at a wide distance from the homely strains of his songs.'

Passages such as these reveal the author as one truly 'sealed of the tribe' of Robert Herrick. When his book goes, as it ought, into a second edition he will doubtless remove the incidental blemishes which at present interfere with the unalloyed enjoyment of a 'study' distinguished both by its scholarship and its critical insight.

Just as this notice was being written, another and still more elaborate study of Herrick was published by a French scholar, Dr Floris Delattre. His work had been virtually completed before Dr Moorman's appeared, though he makes some references to it in his notes. The English and the French volumes present interesting points of comparison and contrast, with which I hope to deal in a later number of this *Review* in a notice of Dr Delattre's book.

F. S. Boas.

London.

La Jeunesse de Shelley. Par A. Koszul. Paris: Bloud. 1910. 8vo. xxii + 439 pp.

M. Koszul does not set out to write of Shelley's external life. His aim is to enter into the successive states of his mind, and by this road to approach his poetry, the poetry being resonant in a peculiar degree of his personal concerns and full of secret allusion to them. This purpose involved, however, the re-examining and re-telling of the main matter of the biography. For in the period which the book covers—that is, up to the departure for Italy in 1818—the story of the poet's

art is more deeply implicated in his circumstances than in the years when he wrote his best. His theme (to give M. Koszul's argument) was the mystery and beauty of Nature and the potential divinity of Man; but in England he was too much plagued by his environment and too deeply immersed in his battles with it to grow into these truths in a kindly way and to become an artist. The early intellectualism, to which only persecution could have held him so long, was all counter to his natural bent. The spiritual barrenness of the first marriage was another check to his power. And when the poetic gift had been quickened by the union with Mary Godwin and by his recognition of the tragic insatiability in his nature, his wife's suicide and the public branding in the Court of Chancery threw him once more into the highly strung mood of the outcast. For this reason the poetry of 1817, though full of the new ability, is a tumultuous and in some ways crude poetry, a passionate self-confession in the guise of objective romance. To attain to great art he needed to get away from England to that 'Paradise of exiles' where a wonderful past was nearer to him than the present. Of this development we have before us a more intensive study than any hitherto published, the very kind of book for which there was room and need. The environments Shelley moved into, the impact on him of books and life, were matters which called, not only for an imaginative use of the knowledge to hand, but, even at this time of the day, for supplementary research. M. Koszul brings into account all the relevant publications—or almost all—up to the time of writing, and adds a mass of annotation from his own enquiries. And he handles his theme with a fine sympathy for both its moral and its literary content, with eager and copious observation, and with a practised pen. If, in his zeal to chart the ground clearly and fully, he is apt at times, one may think, to draw his contours too incautiously and to see too much, the faults are quite outweighed by a good deal else that commends itself as both new and true.

To touch on a few main subjects:—A long neglect of criticism is made good in the first chapter which points out the signs of the coming Shelley in the novels and poems written at Eton. But we know too little of the days in which so much of the poet's making was accomplished, and this book can tell us little more than its predecessors of the old philosopher, James Lind, who seeded his mind in the seeding time. The episode of Harriet Grove is another of the passages, so frequent in this history, where the evidence is loose or lacking and the historian construes by his own judgement. To Mr Clutton Brock, for instance, the letters to Hogg at Christmas, 1810, are only an odd mixture of metaphysical flightiness and calf love. M. Koszul supposes a real passion and a cardinal event. The letters, he argues, are tumultuous, and seem artificial only because of the striving to control the pain and see the disaster philosophically. In all their tumult he finds a recurring order of expression:—the pain first smoulders in abstract discussions, then fumes more hotly in vows against intolerance, then bursts into flame in a simple cry or plaint. And not only was this the first of

several affairs that brought home to Shelley the tyrannies of the world, but it hurried him into his marriage. He married the second Harriet to fend off the memory of the first; not through any sensuous attraction, which he was 'too agitated' to feel, but in the deliberate and even hesitant hope of curing his wound. M. Koszul can argue plausibly for this reading of the obscure text, but it is a venturesome one. Waiving any argument about the letters to Hogg, the serious view of the first love affair was utterly scouted by Peacock. If Shelley returned to Oxford in his second term fretting with despair, Hogg never remarked it. And in the letters of the four months before the marriage Harriet Grove is not mentioned above once or twice[1].

It may be true that the letters to Miss Hitchener become warmer and more personal in tone after the first visit to Ireland. But it seems a dubious conjecture that Shelley was already losing heart in his marriage and went a second time to Cwm Elan to get some help from its associations. Again, the account of Mrs Boinville and her circle and of the influence they exerted is surely overcoloured. Shelley was once or twice made welcome at Bracknell without his wife; Mrs Newton used to call Harriet 'the lady'; Mrs Boinville, when Shelley visited her after his seemingly aimless rush to Edinburgh at the end of 1813, writes that 'he is making a trial of homespun pleasures with us, and likes them so well that he is resolved to give up rambling and begin a course of them himself.' In all this M. Koszul spies danger. He suggests that these ladies—or perhaps only Cornelia Turner—were flirting with Shelley, and were at pains to get him away from Harriet. The whole *coterie* was a volatile medium—'un monde dont les acteurs aimaient s'étourdir au choc des controverses de salon, s'enivrer de reparties et de citations, et papillonner parfois autour du scabreux.' And so it will have been by Peacock's advice, who was on her side, that Harriet took Shelley off to Edinburgh to save him from this 'sensualisme de salon,' this 'société dangereuse et légère,' and to conjure back her happiness on sacred ground (p. 202). For all this view of the Bracknell circle M. Koszul has only the very slightest evidence, which he obtains by a laborious cumulation of trifles or of nothings. It seems probable that in regard to the weightier matters of morals these friends of Shelley were strict, as is apparent, for example, by the letter from Mrs Boinville to Hogg referred to on p. 194. But to dwell only on what seem to be weak points in the biography is to ignore its frequent quality of *justesse*. And one important conjecture will strike the reader with instant force. It has always seemed strange that the *Alastor* should follow so closely on the fruition of Shelley's love for Mary Godwin. M. Koszul, pointing to his relations with Claire Clairmont in 1815, surmises that here is the key of the mystery. Through that temptation the poet had become aware that the intractable desire in his nature must cling to him through life like a penal spirit.

[1] The letter to Charles Grove (Dowden I. 169) talks of her, as it was bound to do. Mr Ingpen, in his collected edition of the correspondence, supposes an emotional passage in the letter of April 26, 1811, to refer to her; but it is surely Elizabeth Shelley who is meant.

Throughout the period Shelley is represented as first taking the intellectualism of the Revolution and then getting rid of it. He did not succumb altogether for a while and then throw the trouble off with a strong revulsion, like Wordsworth; he contended with it hard and long, but contended always. M. Koszul brings out the frequent contradiction between the agnostic pamphlets and the intellectual humility and random gleams of faith in the private letters. The turn of the conflict comes with the passionate year 1814. In 1816, when Shelley visited Lausanne and spoke of Gibbon's cold soul, 'l'intellectualisme est bien mort; à sa place est instauré le culte des émotions intimes.' *Laon and Cythna* 'marque le triomphe définitif, conscient et consenti cette fois, de la préoccupation artistique sur toutes les autres.' But perhaps these truths are too incautiously expressed. It should have been made clear that the process in Shelley was to subordinate, and not to suppress, the sceptical faculty, and that the distinction of his work is in the concurrence of the two powers. A useful section of the book describes his early speculations in philosophy, drawn mainly from Godwin, Sir William Drummond, and finally Berkeley, when he was vacillating between a conception of the world as matter interfused with spirit and as spirit pure and simple. How hard it is to define his ultimate view is shown by the hesitancy of M. Koszul's language about it. He says (p. 162) that the Shelleyan pantheism is 'le germe vivant, non épanoui, non organisé, resté tout individuel et sentimental, d'une religion qui nait.' In another place he quarrels with the term Pantheism, and would prefer to call Shelley a mystic (p. 303):—

'S'il lui fallait définir sa position, choisir un système, il préférait toujours le rétranchement négatif de son titre de défi: athée. C'est qu'en effet, qu'il s'agisse d'un Dieu-Personne ou d'un Dieu-Nature, tout théisme implique à l'égard de Dieu la possibilité, le devoir même, d'un amour de forme humaine, d'un amour fixe, concentré, supérieur à tous les autres, mais de même nature—l'amour religieux. De cela, Shelley depuis longtemps se savait incapable.'

Or do we come with surprise on the well-known line in *The Boat on the Serchio* of 'Him who shaped us to His ends and not our own,' when we remember that Shelley's *anima mundi* is Love, and that it is often addressed in the language of prayer? The main line in the book as to Shelley's art is by way of the Nature poetry. His peculiar power in this respect is considered as showing itself first in *The Assassins* and rising thence through *Alastor* to a rare height in *Mont Blanc* and an assured level of improvement in *Laon and Cythna*. The Shelleyan landscape—'le mouvant mirage à la fois si précis et si invraisemblable, toute cette fantasmagorie éblouissante et fugace'—gains from step to step of this development both in precision of detail and in mystic virtue. Its artistic faults are expounded in a close scrutiny of *Alastor*. Here, it is contended, the poet has not yet mastered his magic of the pathetic fallacy, but uses it to dominate Nature, to make her a mirror of his own consciousness against truth. Aesthetic judgements are hard to dispute; there are plain inconsistencies in the poem; but good critics have taken

a quite different view as to its accuracy in single touches. For the rest the literary sections of the book will probably strike the reader as the best parts of it, admirable as a rule both for keen judgement and just expression. Such are especially the pages on the two modes of Shelley's prose, on the febrility of his poetic style and the consequent principles of textual criticism, on his personifications, on the classical element in his art, and the whole review of *Laon and Cythna*, with its indication of the poet's enlarging humanity. Among the unpublished matter in the appendices there is the full text of Shelley's translation of the Marseillaise, and also an interesting letter from Charles Clairmont, Claire Clairmont's brother, to Francis Place, giving a long and most unflattering description of Harriet Shelley. Finally, the book should have had an index, and it is worthy of better print and better paper.

A. M. D. Hughes.

Kiel.

David Garrick et ses amis français. Par F. A. Hedgcock. Paris: Hachette. 1911. 8vo. 283 pp.

When Johnson said of Garrick, '*οἱ φίλοι οὐ φίλος*—He had friends but no friend,' he spoke but a half truth. The negation is sufficiently disproved by the figure of Garrick's faithful and admirable wife; a book like Dr Hedgcock's helps to confirm the positive assertion. It may fairly be claimed for *David Garrick et ses amis français* that it fills a gap in our knowledge of a man of many friends: for the relations of Garrick with the pick of Parisian society at a very brilliant period have for one reason or another been neglected by his biographers. Davies and Murphy deal chiefly with his life behind the footlights; Mrs Clement Parsons (whose account of Garrick is somewhat perversely regarded by Dr Hedgcock as the best written of all), Mr Joseph Knight and Mr Percy Fitzgerald are so much occupied with his English doings that they have little space for his French affinities, nor for illustrations of the truth of the phrase which Gibbon picked up in the salons after Garrick's death, 'cet homme était fait pour vivre parmi nous.' It is true that Boaden's *Private Correspondence of David Garrick* contains over two hundred letters written to Garrick by his French admirers, but Boaden's folios are not very accessible and are not altogether satisfactory when found. There was room therefore for this new book, and the author may be congratulated on his performance. He has availed himself of all, or nearly all, the existing sources both in French and English. He does not appear to know Gaehde's *David Garrick als Shakespeare-Darsteller* (Berlin, 1904), nor Sir Theodore Martin's charming 'Quarterly' article (1868); but he has made good use of the Forster collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum, and has brought to light many interesting documents unpublished hitherto. The arrangement of the material is not at first sight convincing. The book is divided

into four chapters, of which the first is entitled *Biographie de Garrick*, etc. But it is far from being a complete biography and is concerned with the detail of the life only down to 1741 and Garrick's appearance as Richard III at Goodman's Fields, the subsequent events being relegated to a footnote of ten lines. It is only when we consider the title and the rest of the volume, which describes the first visit to Paris (ch. II), the grand tour (ch. III), and the French correspondence (ch. IV), that we see the reason for this sudden *stretto*. Dr Hedgcock is evidently following the good example of Sainte-Beuve in prefixing to the study of a special point a summary of his subject's *débuts*. With regard to the first visit to Paris, Mr Joseph Knight was constrained in 1894 to plead lack of information in excuse for silence. The episode is indeed an obscure one in Garrick's career, to which he refers once in a letter to his brother, and never again—a silence which effectually discredits the story of his presentation at Court. Some fresh light has been contributed by M. Trenck-Brentano (cp. *La Bastille des comédiens*, 1903) and Dr Hedgcock seems inclined to suggest that Garrick beat a hasty retreat when he found how near he had come to For l'Evêque for attempting to coax French dancers across the channel. But Paris had laid her spell upon him, and he was anxious to return thither, as Sterne did, even during the war. Hostile relations between the two countries did not disturb Garrick's private relations to his friends, *e.g.* C.-P. Patu and J.-G. Noverre, and an account of them bridges the interval till the Peace of Paris and Garrick's grand tour. This is well described by Dr Hedgcock, especially the two visits to Paris, where he was welcomed with enthusiasm and during six months made free of the 'royaume de la rue St Honoré' and the houses of d'Holbach and Helvétius. The anecdotist will find plenty of amusement in the description of Garrick *salonais*; for the student of literary history the most important feature is the actor's commerce with Diderot. Dr Hedgcock traces to the influence of Garrick the change wrought in Diderot's histrionic theory between 1750 and 1770 (or 1773, to be exact). In *Dorval et moi* the actor was told to play according to the impulse of the moment; in the *Paradoxe* he is bidden practise reflexion, imitation, memory. And Garrick was a living example of the truth of Diderot's maturer principles. He had 'the art of mimicking everything, and the same aptitude for every sort of character and part'; and how little he let sensibility cloud judgment is shewn by the 'yeux terribles' which he made at Morellet during the full passion of *Othello* when the Abbé, sitting in the orchestra, ventured to disobey orders and peep away from the stage to the book. But despite the enthusiasm which he awakened, despite Diderot's precepts and his own practice, Garrick had little effect upon the French actors of the better sort, who stuck to their traditional style, and a bad effect upon the mediocre, who caught his tricks but not his genius. He himself learnt much from France. He acted, by general consent, better after his tour than before it. 'It was remarked,' says Davies, 'that our Roscius had, by visiting foreign theatres greatly profited in his mode of representation...his action was become more easy

and unrestrained...his deportment was more graceful and his manner more elegant...he did not appear to be so solicitous for applause as to distrust his own feelings and lessen the pleasure of the audience.' Moreover he borrowed many hints for mounting and decoration from the Opéra and Opéra Comique. But though his immediate debt to France was greater than France's debt to him, his ultimate influence was profound. He was, as Dr Hedgcock says, a sort of link between the countries and a herald of the *entente*. And his association, nay, his identification with Shakespeare served unseen to prepare the way for the romantic dramatists, for whom Shakespeare was the 'poeta sovrano.'

It is usual nowadays to underrate the services which Garrick rendered to Shakespeare, and from this tendency Dr Hedgcock is not altogether free. Doubtless Garrick laid violent hands on the object of his worship, to whom he built a Greek temple and set up a statue by a French sculptor; he supplied new endings; he adapted the plays to suit the taste of the day and encouraged Ducis to do the same. But if he had not consulted that taste, he would probably not have given Shakespeare the vogue he did. And as Sir Theodore Martin points out, there are other and worse ways of outraging the poet besides those which Garrick used; and he at least read aright what he preserved:

> Best commentator on great Shakespeare's text,
> When Garrick acts, no passage seems perplext.

And how splendidly he stood up for Shakespeare against his detractors, Morellet, and Voltaire himself! It is difficult to understand how Dr Hedgcock can allege that Voltaire would never have been so impertinent as to call Shakespeare only a barbarian, in view of the language of the Preface to *Sémiramis* and of the *Letter to the Academy*. '*Hamlet*...est une pièce grossière et barbare.' 'Ce Shakespeare si sauvage, si bas, si effréné, et si absurde, avait des étincelles de génie.... Un Gille...un Saltimbanque qui a des saillies heureuses et qui fait des contorsions.' Morellet and Voltaire both deserved the strong words which Garrick levelled at them. 'French dog!' and 'O the damned fellow!'

Of Garrick's general capacity and personal character Dr Hedgcock writes fairly and generously. His gift of epigram is praised as it well deserves: his limitations as a dramatist are rightly measured; and there is nothing in these pages that will alter the good opinion which the world has formed of him who was 'a genius and a gentleman.'

Not the least important feature of the book is the appendix on Garrick's family, which disposes of the legend (sanctioned by the biographers and no doubt by Garrick himself) that he was of noble birth. Other appendixes contain the text of the new letters, nine of Garrick's and two of d'Holbach's (in excellent English), a list of the Shakespeare plays produced or acted by Garrick, a sample of his treatment of *Romeo and Juliet*, and a bibliography. An alphabetical index gives completeness to a very scholarly piece of work.

The book is well printed[1], but the paper is indifferent and the sewing nothing less than disgraceful.

H. F. Stewart.

Cambridge.

Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste, étudié dans les romans de Wessex. Par F. A. Hedgcock. Paris: Hachette. 1911. 8vo. 508 pp.

This book is one of those which have been described as very profitable, particularly to the writers thereof. Dr Hedgcock has spared no pains, and must have had much pleasure, in compiling it. He has held long commerce with Mr Hardy in all his works. The range of his *Essai de critique*, as he modestly calls it, is wider than the title-page suggests, and includes, besides the novels, the *Wessex Poems* and *The Dynasts*. No side of the writer's genius has been neglected. The development of his thought is diligently traced, from its first beginnings down to the settled pessimism of his latest utterance, which is of course contrasted with the optimism of George Meredith. His affinities, natural and acquired, his resemblances and dissemblances, are noted, out of a full knowledge of English and French literature; his treatment of woman, of the Dorset peasant, of nature, receives its proper appreciation. Dr Hedgcock turns his author this way and that, indicates his personal characteristics as well as those of his personages, examines each of the novels, describes their style, and assigns to Mr Hardy his place—a very high one—among the artists and thinkers of the nineteenth century. Nothing, in fact, is left unsaid; and here is the reason why the book is probably not destined to enjoy a very wide circulation. For, as Dr Hedgcock himself quotes in a different connexion, 'Le secret d'ennuyer est celui de tout dire.' Some justification for the extreme length of the book is afforded by the fact that it introduces a new writer to a foreign audience, and the French reader will doubtless value the analyses and extracts, which are all very skilfully done. But even for him there is some danger lest instead of visiting the temple itself (an architectural metaphor is permissible where Mr Hardy is concerned) he weary himself by wandering in the peristyle.

The English reader will probably doubt whether any living writer in his tongue deserves 500 pages of critical study, feeling that only the great dead, and the greatest of them, can stand such a test. He will regret that Dr Hedgcock had not time to make his study shorter and compress the results of his examination into more reasonable compass. For instance, we might have been spared some of the discussion on Mr Hardy's philosophy; that philosophy, although profound, and profoundly interesting, is simple enough and apparently independent. There was hardly need to cast about for 'influences' such as Schopenhauer to account for it, though Dr Hedgcock certainly adduces some curious parallels and might have added others. Mr Hardy himself denies the

[1] Misprints occur on pp. 38, 61 and 62.

impeachment and Mr Gosse assures us in a letter which Dr Hedgcock loyally prints at the end of his volume, that the ideas underlying the Wessex novels have been present in Mr Hardy's mind from the first and are the outcome of personal temperament and observation. With regard to Mr Hardy's art, it is true that many of Dr Hedgcock's conclusions were anticipated by Mr Lionel Johnson nineteen years ago. But since 1894 there has appeared the crowning example of Mr Hardy's latest manner, as well as the poems which contain in essence the theory expressed in that manner. It is in the handling of this that the chief value and novelty of Dr Hedgcock's essay consists, at least for us on this side of the Channel. He remarks the diapason that begins in the *Poems* and continues to sound through *The Dynasts*, giving unity and coherence to Mr Hardy's *œuvre*, and the chapters which deal with this are important for all students of English literature.

Apart from the general criticism already adventured which only applies where the reader is familiar with previous attempts to appreciate Mr Hardy's work, there is no cause to quarrel with Dr Hedgcock's presentation of his case. There are however one or two *obiter dicta* which are open to challenge. For instance, the remark that Wordsworth was 'pour les choses inanimées un observateur assez superficiel,' provokes an obvious 'tu quoque' and a reference to Professor Raleigh's passage on Wordsworth and Nature.

The volume is adorned with two portraits of Mr Hardy, neither of them very sympathetic, and there is a satisfactory bibliography. The 'Ausstattung'—paper, print and sewing—is the same as that of Dr Hedgcock's *Garrick* published by the same firm.

H. F. Stewart.

Cambridge.

A History of English Versification. By Jakob Schipper. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. xx + 390 pp.

This book is an English version of the *Grundriss der englischen Metrik*, an abridgement of the author's well-known *Englische Metrik*, which has had considerable circulation in Germany. Dr Schipper says that the English text of the present volume is a close rendering of the German book, 'except in the first few chapters, which have been somewhat more fully worked out,' adding that some modern poets, who seemed to be unduly neglected in the German book, have now received a larger share of attention. The views of Dr Schipper are of course already known to scholars, but as this is the first appearance of his work in an English dress, it may be convenient to treat it in this notice as a new book.

It is hardly necessary to say that it is in some respects admirable. It has just those qualities of formal and systematic treatment which are most wanting in Professor Saintsbury's *History of English Prosody*,

while at the same time it lacks most of the merits which distinguish those very readable volumes. Professor Schipper and Professor Saintsbury are in a sense complementary to one another; the one has his eye always upon the rule, and the other on the exception. What the result might be if they could be brought to cooperate, it is better not to enquire. In another matter too each is weak where the other is strong. Dr Schipper is for the most part admirable upon the older periods, but perfunctory and superficial when dealing with anything later than the sixteenth century. Professor Saintsbury, on the other hand, improves as he goes on, and is at his best in treating of the poetry which comes nearest to his own time. Dr Schipper indeed almost totally omits the modern period from his calculations, except in the classification of stanza forms. This is perhaps the result of a wise discretion; but a book in which there is no real investigation, for example, of the blank verse of Milton, or of the couplet of Dryden and Pope, has no right to be called a History of English Versification. The first chapter, which deals with metrical principles, is fairly satisfactory, in spite of some vagaries. We have here a praiseworthy attempt to define the word 'accent,' and a valuable distinction between the logical, rhetorical and rhythmical accent, the latter of which properly belongs to poetry alone, and may often give to a word or syllable an amount of stress which it would not naturally have in prose. In dealing with word-accent Dr Schipper says:

> In the Teutonic languages, the root syllable, as the most important element of the word, and that which conveys the meaning, always bears the chief accent, the other syllables bearing accents which are subordinate to this chief accent (p. 7).

But English is far from being a purely Teutonic language in its vocabulary, and it should have been observed that this rule applies only in a very limited degree to the non-Teutonic elements. Words like 'accent,' 'syllable,' 'consonant,' 'specific,' 'emphasis,' 'illustrate,' do not in the least conform to it.

Dr Schipper's account in his second chapter of the Old English alliterative verse begins with a good statement of the controversy with regard to a two-beat or a four-beat form of hemistich, coming down from Lachmann, though (as we are reminded) not Lachmann but his followers applied the four-beat theory to the English hemistich. The author does justice to Percy's account of the matter in his essay 'On Alliterative Metre,' which was far in advance of his time[1]. Dr Schipper remarks:

> Had this essay of Percy's been known to Lachmann's followers, many of the forced attempts at reconciling the Old English verse with a scheme that involved a fixed number of syllables in the line would not have been made (p. 21).

The account given of the structure of Old English verse is very complete and elaborate—too much so indeed for a student's manual. The author has apparently aimed at compressing his statement into a

[1] *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, Series the Second.

short compass without any considerable omission of detail, and the result of such a proceeding, when applied to so complicated a subject, is of course to make the statement far more difficult. At least the more and the less essential portions of it should have been distinguished by difference of type. At present the student is confronted with such a mass of detail that he will be apt to give up altogether the attempt to comprehend the system. In some points too Dr Schipper is too absolute. In dealing with alliteration, for example, he says, 'Wherever a vowel seems to alliterate with an *h*, we are justified in assuming a corruption of the text.' This is a very doubtful statement even as regards *Beowulf*, in which the name 'Hunferð' (which there is no reason to suspect) regularly alliterates with vowels.

The third and fourth chapters of the First Book are by far the best part of the work. These deal with the development of the alliterative line in late Old English and early Middle English, and with the part which it plays, in its more conservative form, in the poetry of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This subject is for the most part admirably treated. Dealing with the metre of Layamon the author powerfully opposes the theory of Trautmann and Einenkel, that it is an imitation of Otfrid, and points out that the development of Layamon's metre, which is observable in the course of his poem,

> is with much more probability to be explained by the continual occupation of the poet with the Norman-French original poem, and by the increasing influence which its short octosyllabic couplets must naturally have exercised upon his own rhythms, than by a supposed intention of the poet to write in 'primitive Germanic four-beat song-metre,' the very existence of which is hypothetical (p. 71).

With reference to *King Horn* Dr Schipper says with justice:

> The evidence of the metre of this poem, showing its affinity to the alliterative line and its historical origin from it, is so cogent, that it is unnecessary to discuss the theories of Prof. Trautmann and the late Dr Wissmann, both of whom, although from different points of view, agree in ascribing a four-beat rhythm to this metre (p. 82).

The fourth chapter gives an excellent historical account of the forms in which the native metre was conserved during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and of the influence which it had upon the poetry of that period; and the author ends his statement by an interesting series of quotations, going back chronologically from the nineteenth century to the seventh, to illustrate the fact that the primitive Germanic metre has had a continuous history in English poetry from the earliest times down to the present.

The clear distinction which the author draws between native and foreign elements in English metre and rhythm is one of his most valuable contributions to the subject, and his treatment of 'Foreign Metres' in Chapters VI—IX is fairly satisfactory so far as the M.E. period is concerned. But the references here to Modern English are often disquieting, and in too many instances the authorities quoted for Modern English are Wyatt and Surrey, who should not be taken as

authorities for anything except the transition period, especially where the question is one of word-accent. Surrey was more master of his craft than Wyatt, but even he is insecure; and if Dr Schipper had thoroughly studied his metrical system, he would probably have allowed that in the line,

Love that liveth and reigneth in my thought,

a rhythmical stress on the inflexional syllable of 'liveth' was intended by the writer, and not a suppression of anacrusis.

What is said about omission of thesis in the interior of the line (pp. 139—41) is far from satisfactory. The line

Ne leve no man to muchel to childe ne to wive,

is not an example of omission of thesis, but of the intermixture of alexandrine with septenary which is common in the *Poema Morale* and in other pieces of the kind. Both the lines quoted from Surrey are cases of inversion of accent in the second foot.

Again, the author's views on the so-called 'epic cæsura' (p. 145) are more than doubtful. For Chaucer he quotes

To Canterbury with ful devout corage[1],

and

What sholde he studie, and make hym selven woôd?

both of which have been shewn by ten Brink to be beside the mark. Words like 'studie,' 'storie,' etc. are dissyllables, the 'i' being absorbed, and are regularly reduced by elision to monosyllables, and 'Canterbury' is treated by Chaucer as a trisyllable, cp. *Prol.* 16. Again, the quotations from Surrey given on p. 216 as examples of the epic cæsura in Modern English are quite inapplicable, e.g.

The nightingale with feathers new she sings,

or

The sote season that bud and bloom forthbrings.

Can Dr Schipper really suppose that the final *e* of words like 'nightingale' and 'sote' was usually pronounced as a metrical syllable in Surrey's verse[2]? Nor again will the Milton examples on p. 146 serve. The treatment of 'Temple' and 'Spirit' in the lines quoted is quite independent of the cæsura (cp. *Par. Lost*, i. 139, 402, etc.), and the other line quoted was written by Milton

Created hugest that swim th' Ocean stream.

[1] This line is quoted in at least four different places in illustration of Dr Schipper's theory. It is apt to rouse some suspicion about the theory when a single quotation has to be worked so hard.

[2] On p. 160 the author makes the amazing statement that the final *e* is treated in 'Modern English' poetry as in Modern High German: it may be either used as a thesis or be slurred over or become quite silent. This statement about final *e* used as a thesis seems to be founded upon some exceptional or doubtful passages of Wyatt and Surrey. The author admits that it is not so found even in Spenser.

The fact is that, so far as English verse is concerned, this phenomenon should be called the 'dramatic cæsura.' It is frequently used by Shakespeare and by other dramatists, but hardly in any other kind of verse.

In the portion of the book which deals with particular metres the treatment is very unequal. The septenary line, for example, is very sufficiently referred to its Latin and French models, and the metre of Robert of Gloucester and some of the Moralities is well explained by illustration of the M.E. practice of varying freely between septenaries and alexandrines in the same series, a practice which is connected further with the systematic combination of the two which Gascoigne called 'poulter's measure,' in a casual jest which has had great success in modern times. This kind of treatment, however, has less satisfactory results when applied to the metres which have their principal development in the Modern English period; and these after all are of greater importance for English poetry. The history of the rhyming heroic verse ends, practically, in the sixteenth century, so far as Dr Schipper is concerned. The seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are dismissed in a single page (p. 218), and Waller is not even mentioned. Room, however, is found for the remark, 'Initial truncation or the absence of an unaccented syllable internally is hardly to be found in the verse of Dryden and Pope,' surely a too cautiously qualified statement, and for the assertion that 'Pope, in his original poems, completely avoids triplets,' which is distinctly inaccurate. There are at least half a dozen examples in the *Essay on Criticism*, and several in the later work, *e.g. Moral Essays*, i. 155, *Epistle to Arbuthnot*, l. 323. Blank verse fares a little better; but the account of Shakespeare's metrical development is inadequate, and almost all the statements are taken at second hand. The treatment of Fletcher and Massinger is quite insufficient, and the statement that feminine endings are used by Fletcher 'in some plays even more often than masculine ones' suggests the character of the information upon which Dr Schipper relies. In plays which are attributed to Fletcher alone there are often twice as many feminine as masculine endings. Milton, whose blank verse, Dr Schipper tells us, 'is of greater importance than that of the minor dramatists,' is disposed of in less than two pages, and to the blank verse of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Thomson, Young, Cowper, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Swinburne, just one page is assigned altogether.

The author's classification of stanza forms is more satisfactory and has a wider range, but the nomenclature is unnecessarily cumbrous and technical. 'Bipartite Unequal-membered Isometrical Stanzas' is one heading, and 'Bipartite Unequal-membered Anisometrical Stanzas' another, whence we proceed in due order to 'Tripartite Isometrical' and 'Tripartite Anisometrical,' etc. Moreover the treatment is almost purely formal. The varieties in external form of the Spenserian stanza, in the hands of Giles and Phineas Fletcher and Donne, for example, are noted, but nothing is said about the manner in which the original stanza itself is handled by various poets, or the important differences

between the Spenserian stanza of Byron or of Shelley and the first model.

There is a chapter on Spenser's *Epithalamium* stanza and its relation to other Ode-forms, and one on the Sonnet, which contains the statement that Milton 'paid no regard to the relationship of its single parts, or to the distribution of the contents through the quatrains and terzets' (p. 376). This is surely a very extraordinary remark. Milton claims a certain freedom, no doubt, but he is far from disregarding the relationship of the parts of the Sonnet. He wrote nineteen English sonnets, and eight of these have the *volta* at the regular place, at the end of the eighth line. Of the remainder three have the pause so as to break the eighth line, and five have it either in the middle or at the end of the ninth.

On the whole it may be said that Dr Schipper has given us a very useful account of the prosody of the Old and Middle English periods, especially the latter; but he would have been better advised, if in appealing to English readers he had confined himself to these. As a manual professing to deal with English prosody as a whole his book is obviously insufficient, and the fullness of its treatment of one portion of the subject only throws up into stronger relief his neglect of the rest.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

An Introduction to the Study of Literature. By William Henry Hudson. London: Harrap. 1910. 8vo. 432 pp.

It is not by any means an easy task which Mr Hudson has set himself in this work. It amounts to an attempt to set forth by way of an introduction to literature some of the essentials of literary work, and the task was one which required not only a wide range of knowledge and a discreet selection of material but also clear views and definite statements on a subject that is perhaps peculiarly elusive. Mr Hudson has however shown himself to be specially well qualified for such a piece of work, and the result is an eminently readable volume which we venture to think will appeal to a large class of student, to the more widely read as well as to others less well equipped.

The work is apparently written in the first instance for general readers and in their interest the writer turns his back on 'questions of abstract æsthetics' as well as 'details of a purely scholastic kind.' But this is a course which has merits of its own: it has in no way hindered a scholarly treatment. Within his self-imposed limits Mr Hudson has succeeded in giving a sound and comprehensive view of his subject, while at the same time infusing into his work interest of a practical kind.

The first two chapters are taken up with a discussion of literature in general and with a consideration of the most profitable methods of study, in the course of which it is shown that literary work must

be viewed in relation to its author, as well as in relation to its age, to past ages and other literatures. Then follows a chapter on the elements of poetry, embodying a treatment of its content, its technique and its relation to life. A study of prose fiction comes next and this involves an exposition of such elements as plot, characterisation and dialogue as well as its relation to life. The fifth chapter, perhaps the best, has for its subject the drama, while the concluding one, which is rather more discursive, deals with the functions and methods of literary criticism.

But no analysis is capable of conveying the real merits of the work, and what strikes one most is the sanity of the treatment, the way in which the writer has succeeded in anticipating questions on fundamental points which occur to most thinking readers but which are often either ignored or superficially treated in works of a more pretentious kind. Mr Hudson's treatment of such matters as poetic truth, the relations existing between poetry and metre, between the novel and the drama, and between the drama and stage conditions, furnishes examples of this. And moreover there is everywhere present a clearness and freshness of treatment which is partly due to the writer's lucid style, partly to the store of examples with which he illustrates his work. There is in fact a complete absence of pedantry, and of those technical terms which seem nowadays to threaten literary study. It is only occasionally that Mr Hudson resorts to unfamiliar terminology, as for instance in the phrase 'the proportion of dialogue to compact chronical' (p. 202). It is true that little if any new ground is opened up in the work: but at the same time, guidance of a most efficient and entertaining kind is given over territory already explored. An intimate acquaintance is shown with recent scholarship, though it may be doubted whether the rather unsympathetic reference to Coleridge as a critic (see p. 250 note), and the statement with regard to the function of the gravedigger's scene in *Hamlet* (p. 275) would meet with general acceptance. All the same, the work is full of good things happily presented: it will doubtless commend itself to teacher and student alike, by reason of its useful matter and its originality of treatment: and, it might be added, its value as a text-book will be found to be considerably increased by the careful index which appears at the end.

J. W. H. Atkins.

Aberystwyth.

Landmarks in French Literature. By G. L. Strachey. (Home University Library of Modern Knowledge.) London: Williams and Norgate. 8vo. 246 pp.

Mr Strachey has performed an extremely difficult task extraordinarily well. It was no easy matter to write in less than two hundred and fifty pages a sketch of French literature which should

convey to the reader the spirit of that literature in an eminently readable form. The qualifications which have enabled Mr Strachey to produce this result are a close sympathy with his subject, a sane and independent judgment, and a remarkable power of pregnant and graphic expression. Naturally he is not equally familiar with every period of French literature. But with the ages of Richelieu and Louis XIV and with the eighteenth century at its full tide he is thoroughly at home. These periods occupy rather more than three-fifths of his book, as compared with three volumes out of eight in the composite history of Petit de Julleville. Mr Strachey's neglect of the dull transitional periods sometimes betrays him into curious statements. Speaking of Villon's poems as typical of the later Middle Ages he says, 'Then all at once the grey gloom lifts, and we are among the colours, the sunshine, and the bursting vitality of the spring.' But as a matter of fact sixty years elapsed between Villon's last poem and the first in which Marot really found himself. 'The long reign of confused ideals and misguided efforts' did not 'come to an end for ever' with the *Lettres Provinciales*, or there would have been no need of Boileau's *Satires* and Molière's *Les Précieuses Ridicules*. A couple of pages is short measure for the transitional period from 1688 to 1721 which prepared the way for the eighteenth century.

Mr Strachey has dealt too in a summary fashion with the earlier centuries, including the sixteenth, but there is a good deal to be said for this. Writing for English readers who are not specialists nor even, probably, students, he has done well to pick out the names that are of general interest. If for Ronsard and Du Bellay he is inadequate, he is thoroughly good on Rabelais. Truly he says that 'the whole vast spirit of the Renaissance is gathered within the pages of his great book.' A more intimate acquaintance with Montaigne will probably lead him to reverse his judgment that he is not a great artist. It is quite true that his style lacks form, for he wrote before the technique of French prose had been worked out and perfected. But there are some great works of art—aye, some of the greatest—that transcend form, because they try to come as close as possible to life. Montaigne's aim was to make his language an exact expression of his thought, and he has succeeded to perfection. Is not this art? It is satisfactory, indeed, to find an Englishman insisting upon the importance of form, but does not Mr Strachey carry his devotion to form too far? As for instance, when he says that 'if all that great nation had ever done or thought were abolished from the world, except a single sentence of Voltaire's, the essence of their achievement would have survived.' Finally, a place for D'Aubigné and Regnier should have been found in this chapter.

From Corneille onwards Mr Strachey is at his very best. He is excellent both on Corneille, whose romantic spirit he rightly notes, and on Pascal, though a *caveat* must be entered against the statement that in his last years 'he sank into a torpor of superstition.' Mr Strachey does not quite understand the spirit and functions of the Academy.

Molière 'remained outside it,' not because the Academy was 'timid or out of date,' but because he was an actor, and therefore a social outcast. The only omission that is questionable in this chapter is that of Descartes, whose influence on French literature, though sometimes exaggerated, was a very real one.

The seventy pages which are devoted to the age of Louis XIV are among the best in the book. The general characterisation of the age and the treatment of individual writers are as sound as they are vivid. The services of Boileau are duly recognised, and nothing could be better than the handling of Molière and La Fontaine. 'Whatever tune he may be playing there is never a note too much,' is excellently said of the great fabulist. But it is to the fourth member of this remarkable quartette that Mr Strachey gives the most careful and the fullest treatment. Starting from the remark that Englishmen have always detested Racine he sets to work to remove this antipathy and to explain why France 'declares with one voice' (there is some exaggeration in this) 'that Racine is not only one of the greatest of dramatists, but also one of the greatest of poets.' He points out with perfect truth the defective methods of Elizabethan drama, and contrasts them with those of Racine. Racine's watchword, he says, was 'concentration' and the true importance of the unities 'lies simply in their being a powerful means towards concentration.' This has been said before by M. Lemaître, but it cannot be said too often. In trying to prove that Racine was a great poet (in the more limited sense of the term) Mr Strachey has set himself a more difficult task. For even French writers do not contend that his style is a highly poetical one. 'Souvent,' says M. Lemaître, 'il rase la prose, mais avec des ailes.' Mr Strachey gives four specimens of Racine's poetry, but it is significant that each consists of a single line, and that two of them are among the commonplaces of Racinian criticism. Mr Strachey would have been on firmer ground if he had recognised that Racine's style, like that of Sophocles apart from his choruses, is not imaginative, and therefore not highly poetical, but that this does not prevent him from being a great dramatist. 'But Racine...besides being a great poet is also a great psychologist.' With the latter half of this statement everyone will agree, and it is just because English readers are not as a rule interested in psychology that they fail to appreciate Racine. But there is another reason. 'The accidents of character,' finely says Mr Strachey of Racine's personages, 'are not shown us—only its essentials; the human spirit comes before us shorn of its particulars, naked and intense.' That is very true; we are told nothing about the outward appearance of Racine's characters, they appeal not so much to the imagination through the senses as to the intellect alone. But an Englishman's imagination is more nimble than his intellect, and it is only after many readings of Racine that one begins to realise that his characters are really alive. And, when all is said, it is as types rather than as individuals that they are so wonderful. Their speech and outward manners are those of the court of Louis XIV, but their inward truth is for all ages and all classes

of society—they are 'naked human souls.' Hermione might be the heroine of a modern *crime passionnel*; Agrippine might be any dowager who finds her dominion over her son and his estate slipping away from her; Néron any adolescent whose criminal impulses are only kept in check by his fears; Mithridate any elderly lover who is a prey to jealousy. Mr Strachey evidently does not agree with those critics who pronounce *Athalie* to be his finest work, but he might have pointed out that Racine, who, like every true artist, was always making experiments, has here made a new departure in the direction of spectacular effect.

Doing full justice to La Rochefoucauld and La Bruyère Mr Strachey is inadequate on Bossuet, as he is on Fénelon in the next chapter, and, strange to say, he omits Bourdaloue altogether. But Bourdaloue is as great a psychologist as any of his contemporaries; his style is a model of clarity and intellectual vigour; and of all preachers that ever lived he is perhaps the most effective as a moralist. It is also strange that Mme de Sévigné is dismissed with a single line. Saint-Simon's place is with the age of Louis XIV. He was born in 1675, he began to take notes for his *Memoirs* in 1694, but more than this he is emphatically a man of the seventeenth, and not of the eighteenth century. To adduce him as a proof that the eighteenth century was not without emotion is unfortunate. It is even more unfortunate to found an argument on the fact that 'he mentions his wife once.' As a matter of fact he mentions her hardly less than a hundred times. Mr Strachey writes picturesquely on Saint-Simon, but one wonders whether he has read him continuously, or whether he has merely made the tour of his portrait-gallery.

The chapter on the eighteenth century is written with knowledge, sympathy, and insight. The influence of the *salon* and the predominant cult of *esprit* are duly noted. *Le neveu de Rameau* is rightly singled out as Diderot's masterpiece, and the comparison between Diderot and Rabelais is a happy one. Nothing could be more sympathetic than the treatment of Rousseau. Mr Strachey justly lays stress on his originality, especially as compared with Voltaire and Diderot, and he makes the very true remark that he 'was the only man of his age who ever wanted to be alone.' Later in the book he says that Chateaubriand's landscapes are 'less convincing than Rousseau's.' He might have added that Rousseau's may be counted on the fingers of one or at most both hands. It is not easy to be just to Voltaire. Appreciation of him not only as a man but as a writer depends largely upon temperament. Mr Strachey happily points out the striking contrasts in his character, and he is on the whole merciful to his faults and eloquent on his virtues. His style 'is perfect,' he thinks, 'in all that he wrote,'—that is in prose. So it may be, but, except in his letters, it is somewhat of a spare diet. Mr Strachey recognises this himself, for he says 'that a reaction was bound to follow—and a salutary reaction.' The chapter concludes with a vivid and just characterisation of the ten years which elapsed between the deaths of Voltaire and Rousseau and the Revolution. Nothing can be happier than the reference to *Le Mariage de Figaro* and the 'remark that in the sentence, *Vous vous êtes donné la peine de naître*,' one can

hear the flash and snap of the guillotine. André Chénier, whom Mr Strachey rightly recognises as a classicist and not as a precursor of the Romantic Movement, should have come in this chapter, and Buffon, who greatly influenced him, should have had more than a mere reference.

When Mr Strachey comes to the nineteenth century his grasp of his subject perceptibly weakens. His explanation of the Romantic Movement is not altogether satisfactory. He omits all mention of Mme de Staël, whose influence on the movement was hardly less powerful than Châteaubriand's. In saying that Chateaubriand's prose 'retained most of the characteristics of the old tradition' he forgets that he restored the sense of artistic composition. He undervalues the work of Lamartine, a poet whom Englishmen so rarely understand or appreciate. The Romantic Movement was not merely the reintroduction of Rhetoric into literature, it was the reintroduction of the twin bases of poetry, imagination and emotion. As regards individual writers Mr Strachey's criticism of Balzac is particularly sane and just; while recognising his limitations, especially the badness of his style, he does full justice to his real greatness. Vigny and Musset are treated briefly, but with sympathy and insight, though it may be objected that Vigny's verse is hardly 'splendid,' and that Musset's powerful play of *Lorenzaccio* is as formless in construction as an ordinary Elizabethan drama. Mr Strachey says some hard things of *Hernani* and Hugo's plays in general. One must confess that they are not undeserved, but, nevertheless, there is a glamour about *Hernani* which has to be reckoned with. On Hugo's work Mr Strachey is extremely interesting, all the more so because he is evidently perplexed in his judgment. He finds it difficult to reconcile the splendour of Hugo's verse with his intellectual and moral second-rateness. For he sees that Hugo, though a wonderful virtuoso, is not merely a virtuoso; that he aspires to be and often is a great poet. The fact is that we are still too near to Victor Hugo to separate with any finality the dross from the gold, or to determine his rank in the hierarchy of poets.

Mr Strachey follows the French fashion in ignoring Dumas, an attitude which is rather absurd in an Englishman writing for Englishmen. At any rate he should have said something about his dramas, for Dumas was a born dramatist, and his plays have had a real influence on the French stage. Another omission which will surprise English readers is that of Mérimée. It is true that he does not stand so high as he did in the estimation of critics, but practitioners in the art of the short story still regard him as a master, and his letters are among the most delightful in the French language.

In omitting Mérimée altogether and in relegating Sainte-Beuve to the last chapter Mr Strachey has ignored the realistic element which from the very first existed in the Romantic Movement, and which was represented by the writers for the *Globe* and the frequenters of Delécluze's weekly gatherings. It is true that this element was for a time submerged by the triumphs of Victor Hugo. But in 1835 it

began to assert itself, and from 1850 realism became the dominant note of French literature. It was not the impartial, all-embracing realism of a Shakespeare or a Rembrandt; it was rather the one-sided expression of a materialistic and pessimistic age, and it is perhaps on that account that Mr Strachey chooses to call the period from 1850 to 1880 the 'age of criticism' rather than 'the age of realism' or 'science' as a Frenchman would do. He justifies his choice of a term by practically confining his remarks to Sainte-Beuve, Flaubert, the *Parnassiens*, and Baudelaire, Flaubert getting the lion's share. The critical historians, Renan and Taine, are dismissed with a few lines, and the dramatists who were critics of social life, Augier and Dumas fils, are omitted altogether. The next phase of French literature began, not with the death of Flaubert in 1880, but rather with the publication in 1886 of Vogüé's *Le roman russe*, the firstfruits of the new spiritualistic movement. Mr Strachey gives only two examples of this latest period, Maupassant and Verlaine, but of these Maupassant, a truer representative of pure naturalism than either Flaubert or Zola, distinctly belongs to the preceding period. Mr Strachey rightly says at the outset of his last chapter that 'a just estimate' of the work of those writers who belong to these two last phases 'is well nigh impossible: it is so close to us that it is bound to be out of focus.' It is equally impossible to form a just estimate of either period as a whole.

It only remains to congratulate Mr Strachey on the success of his achievement, which cannot fail to give pleasure to all lovers of French literature. If he has omitted some names which should have been included, that is at any rate better than giving a perfunctory account of them. If he has neglected two departments of French literature, in which it is particularly rich, memoirs and letters, that is no doubt because his interest does not lie in that direction. The great merit of his little book is that it expresses sincerely and brilliantly his own opinions, and that these opinions are those of an essentially sane critic, and of one who is in close sympathy with the French mind and the French character.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

Life of the Black Prince by the Herald of Sir John Chandos. Edited from the MS. in Worcester College with linguistic and historical notes. By MILDRED K. POPE and ELEANOR C. LODGE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. lxii + 256 pp.

The contents of the Worcester College MS. have long been known to philologists and especially to historians, first through the edition of H. O. Coxe, printed for the Roxburghe Club (1842)[1], and later also through the publication of M. Francisque Michel (1883). The former

[1] Not 1862, as is erroneously stated in the Introduction, p. vii, l. 3. The correct date, however, appears in the footnote.

was a careful reproduction of the MS., with all its faults and blunders; the latter claimed to be a critical edition, but suffered, like most of M. Michel's enormous literary output, from haste and lack of accuracy. No such fault can be found with the scholarly production of Miss Pope and Miss Lodge. The joint editors possess to a high degree the philological and historical equipment required to carry out successfully the task they had set themselves, and to produce what may well be called an *édition définitive* of this curious and interesting document of the end of the fourteenth century.

The subject of the poem is well known. To quote the words of the editors, 'it is not so much a continuous historical narrative as a record of the leading events in the life of this same Prince, and a eulogy upon his prowess and piety...The Herald begins by a brief description of Edward III's campaign of 1345, culminating in the battle of Crécy, and followed by the capture of Calais. He gives some details of the plot for the recovery of that town at the end of 1349, and then passes almost at once to the years 1355 and 1356, giving a detailed and valuable account of the victory of Poitiers. After this we come, however, to what is by far the most important part of the poem, that in which he treats of the events in which he himself took part: the Spanish expedition made by the Black Prince on behalf of Pedro of Castile, and the battle of Najera or Navarete. Having completed the history of this period, he gives a very brief and sketchy account of the disastrous end of Prince Edward's government of Gascony, and of the war which led to the loss of almost all the possessions acquired at Brétigny, and then with considerable detail recounts the close of his hero's career and his dying moments.' The Herald's account of the Spanish campaign appears to have been utilised by Froissart in his famous Chronicle, and on that score alone must commend itself to students of history. But the poem will appeal quite as strongly to philologists and literary critics. No trouble has been spared in the present edition to deal adequately with the questions of authorship, dialect, phonology and syntax. If I am rightly informed, Miss Pope, a former student of M. Paul Meyer and herself a doctor of the University of Paris, is mainly responsible for this part of the work. If so, she deserves our gratitude for the competent and scholarly way in which she has acquitted herself of a difficult task.

The editors have very little to tell us about the personality of the author, beyond the fact that he was in the service of Sir John Chandos and accompanied his master on the Spanish expedition. What is advanced regarding his origin and nationality, is mostly conjectural and based on internal evidence alone. The theory that the Herald was a Frenchman by birth seems very plausible; that he came from the North Eastern part of France rather than from Brittany, as was surmised by Gröber (*Grundriss*, II, p. 1085), is not improbable. But it is more difficult to admit that the Herald was a native of 'Valenciennes or its neighbourhood' simply on the grounds that the language in which the poem was 'probably' first written was practically identical with that of Froissart. Unfortunately the original version of c. 1385 is lost, and

the text is preserved only in the 'standardised' version of an Anglo-Norman scribe. The editors have, however, submitted the MS. to the minutest scrutiny, and in several instances they have conclusively shown that the scribe tampered with the original. They have accordingly published a critical text of the poem in the dialect of Hainault, tinged with the few Anglo-Norman peculiarities which might well be expected of a man who, when he began to write, had lived among English nobles for at least twenty-five years. Doubtless the Herald meant his poem to serve for the edification of Englishmen and for that very reason he may have indulged in more Anglo-Normanisms than the editors credit him with. On that point, however, the reader can draw his own conclusions, for the text of the MS. has been carefully transcribed and printed side by side with the revised version. With such an arrangement we have no fault to find; but the question suggests itself, whether it was worth the increase of labour, to reproduce in type all the abbreviations of the MS., especially as these abbreviations do not differ in any way from those usually found in Anglo-Norman MSS. of the time, and do not present the least difficulty of interpretation.

The elaboration of the critical text appears to have been prompted and, to some extent, supervised by as learned and eminent an authority as M. Paul Meyer. This fact alone would constitute a guarantee of its reliability, even if the editors had not repeatedly given signal proof of their own ability and scholarship. I should like, however, to suggest a few emendations:

v. 119 is too short, read *Barons et banerez....*

v. 343, retain the reading of the MS., i.e. *Uns roys et uns....*

v. 682, the emendation *leur* for *la ou* is hardly justified; it would be preferable to omit either *ou* or *il.*

v. 1058, read *Onc on ne vit tele appareille*; for if *tel* were used substantively, we should hardly expect the construction *tel pareille*, except in very corrupt Anglo-Norman.

v. 1131 is too short, read *Au Roy que Englois....*

v. 1373, read *Et des autres plus de doi mille.*

v. 2064, retain the reading of the MS., *Ore n'ay je...*; if *or* is substituted for *ore* the line becomes too short.

v. 2283, retain *Estephen*; for *Estephene* renders the line too long.

v. 2347, read *Et des autres bien quatre mille.*

v. 2631 is one syllable short, read *Rengie feurent la tout le jour.*

v. 3010 is too short, read *Si est* for *S'est*[1].

v. 3099 is too long, read *iij mille et cens*, or *iij mille v cens* (as suggested in the note to this line; cf. p. 176).

v. 3134 is too short; M. P. Meyer's emendation, given in the notes, p. 176, should certainly have been adopted.

v. 3237 is too long, read *Estephen* as in *v.* 2283. (It is at all events

[1] The editors have taken it for granted that the original had *se*, and not *si*, throughout. It might, however, be objected that the use of *si* is confirmed by the fact that this spelling occurs three times in the rhymes, viz. *vv.* 1874, 1922, 2378.

hardly logical to propose *Estephene* in one case and *Estiephenes* in the other, both being in the nom. sg.)

vv. 3436—7, another emendation might be suggested, viz. *Vous fac assavoir que amont Fu l'enchauz perilleus et fiers*; *l'* for *li* occurs frequently enough, cf. p. xxxviii (1).

A few inconsistencies on the part of the editors might also be pointed out. Some, indeed, are rectified in the notes and are therefore omitted here. It is probably due to an oversight that the spelling *champ* has sometimes been retained, e.g. *vv.* 356, 363, 655, 681, etc., whilst elsewhere it has been altered to *camp*, e.g. *vv.* 13, 1389, 1532, etc. The scribe spelt the word invariably with *ch*, but there is good reason to think that the original had *c* and not *ch*, seeing that on two occasions the copyist has confused the word with *tamps* (cf. *vv.* 51, 2035).

One might ask also why in *v.* 667 *chastelx* is altered to *chastiaux*, whilst in *v.* 797 it becomes *chastialx*; why *mareschalx* is retained in *vv.* 1209, 3064, whilst *mareschaux* is preferred in *vv.* 1199, 3402. The use of the abbreviations A.N. and A.F. (cf. pp. xl, xliii, xlvi, etc.), to denote apparently one and the same thing, should have been avoided. It is difficult also to admit with the editors that in *v.* 3977 *leure* is a contraction for *la ou* (cf. p. xxviii, l. 3).

Finally a few trifling slips have escaped the vigilance of the editors, e.g.:

p. xiv, l. 17, *Felleton* '*quadrisyllabic*' is obviously meant for *F.* '*trisyllabic.*'

p. xxv, l. 14, instead of 3391, read 3390.

p. xxviii, l. 4, instead of 681 read 682.

p. xl, l. 12, instead of *plus de vi mille* read *plus de iiij mille.*

p. xlii, l. 4, instead of 2943 read 2944.

p. xliv, l. 11, instead of 123 read 124.

The text is followed by an excellent English translation of the whole poem. I think, however, that the editors have missed the meaning of the following passage:

> 95 Ore est raisons que je vous conte
> De ce dont on doit faire acompte:
> C'est du fait de (= que) chevalerie
> En sa persone fu norie,
> En le quele il regna xxx ans.

They have introduced a colon after *chevalerie* and translated: 'and now it is right that I should relate to you that which all should hold in esteem—that is, chivalry: this was upheld in his person, in whom it held sway thirty years.' This rendering is not satisfactory, and the agreement of *il* (masc.) with *chevalerie* (fem.) cannot be defended. I would suggest the following translation: 'and now it is right that I should tell you of the fact which must be taken into account, viz., that chivalry was cultivated in him, and that for thirty years he was supreme in it (i.e., in chivalry).' This is in perfect agreement with historical facts, for the Black Prince won his spurs at Crécy in 1346 and remained

a pattern of knighthood till his death in 1376, i.e. exactly thirty years.

The edition contains also a fairly complete Glossary (*frike* 1512, fem. of *fres, frais* should have been included), and an excellent index of proper names. The references appear to have been checked with the greatest care and the whole work is remarkably free from errors and misprints. The editors deserve our warmest thanks for their valuable contribution to scholarship.

P. STUDER.

SOUTHAMPTON.

La Lyre d'Amour: an Anthology of French Love Poems from earliest times down to 1866. Selected and annotated by CHARLES B. LEWIS. London: Chatto and Windus. 1911. xxiii + 262 pp.

Les poètes du moyen âge occupent à eux seuls un bon quart du volume. Ce fait, à lui seul, témoigne de l'originalité du recueil. Félicitons M. Lewis d'avoir fait la part si belle à la vieille poésie. Il n'est pas sans se rendre compte que bien des lecteurs auront peine à la comprendre, et il écrit dans sa préface: 'Owing to limited space...I have only been able to annotate a certain proportion of the points that call for explanation, but I have tried to select those which would give the greatest difficulty to anyone not possessing a knowledge of the old language.' Ces notes aideront beaucoup ceux à qui le français ancien est non point inconnu, mais peu familier: je doute qu'elles soient d'un grand secours à ceux qui l'ignorent. D'autant plus que M. Lewis, très sagement du reste, nous présente les vieux poètes dans leur dialecte original. Je ne vois guère, par exemple, comment 'anyone not possessing a knowledge of the old language' pourra goûter les deux 'canchons' artésiennes de Conon de Béthune. M. Lewis a raison lorsqu'il juge préférable d'annoter en français moderne les vieux trouvères: mais je pense que le moyen le plus sûr d'initier les profanes aux beautés des œuvres du moyen âge est encore de leur offrir, à côté du texte ancien, une traduction complète en prose moderne.

Le volume est élégant, imprimé en jolis caractères sur bon papier. Malheureusement, trop de fautes déparent le texte. Certaines se corrigent aisément, fautes d'accents ou lettres interverties. D'autres sont moins apparentes et rendent le vers faux.

Voici quelques corrections: p. 84, l. 1, Quand ton col *de* couleur de rose.—p. 141, l. 14, Je m'y suis *plu* depuis...—p. 169, III l. 1, Oh! ne les *pleure* point ces lettres inquiètes.—p. 180, l. 13, Que le bonheur s'enfuit sur *l'aile* des années.—p. 190, II l. 1, Si tu ne m'aimais pas, dis-moi, *fille* insensée.—p. 201, l. 6, *Qu'*on la voit, béante, se tordre...—p. 214, l. 5, Je vis le pied de sa jeune *compagne*.—p. 218, l. 21, Quoi donc! c'est *vainement* qu'ici nous nous aimâmes...—p. 220, l. 5, Eh bien! oubliez-*nous*...—p. 225, l. 7, Par dessus les *vertes* collines.

Voici encore deux ou trois fautes relevées dans les notes: p. 5, note 2, quand *il* (l'embrassade) me manque, lisez *elle*.—p. 22, note 10, löé est

mal traduit par logé, reçu. Il signifie conseillé et il est expliqué deux vers plus bas, Et s'il m'a bon conseil doné....C'est bien, si je ne me trompe, le sens que lui donne M. Huet.—p. 98, Dire que Baïf 'made various metrical innovations and even endeavoured to unite music and poetry' est vague et peu exact. Ronsard et les poètes de son école ont insisté sur l'union étroite de la musique et de la poésie. Il eût fallu ajouter que Baïf tenta d'introduire dans la poésie française la métrique des Grecs et des Latins.

Malgré ces quelques taches, ce livre est une des anthologies les mieux conçues et les plus attrayantes qui aient paru récemment en Angleterre. Le choix des morceaux est intéressant. M. Lewis n'a pas toujours été guidé par la beauté musicale du vers. Les dernières lignes de son introduction tendent à le faire croire. Il y est plus que sévère—injuste pour les Symbolistes. Il méconnait ce qu'il y avait d'intelligent et d'utile dans les modifications qu'ils ont tenté d'apporter à la technique du vers français. Ils voulaient, par des méthodes parfois excessives peut-être, libérer le poète des lisières d'une versification traditionnelle et dogmatique, en rejetant certaines règles devenues désuètes et arbitraires, sinon absurdes. Ils prétendaient que l'oreille fût la seule autorité devant qui s'incline le poète, dont l'art consiste à exprimer en une langue harmonieuse et rythmée, c'est-à-dire musicale, ses idées et ses sentiments. Que M. Lewis se rassure: le symbolisme n'est plus; 'le temps des étranges théories et des exagérations' semble être passé, et peu nombreux sont les poètes vivants qui ne tendent leurs épaules au joug ancien, à peine allégé!

André Barbier.

Aberystwyth.

Histoire de la Poésie française au seizième siècle. Tome I: *L'École des Rhétoriqueurs.* Par Henry Guy. Paris: H. Champion. 1910. 8vo. 390 pp.

Le nombre est considérable des ouvrages parus depuis une vingtaine d'années sur les écrivains français de la Renaissance. La plupart sont des études de détail, beaucoup sont remarquables et l'histoire littéraire de cette période en a été renouvelée. Actuellement encore toute une armée de chercheurs est à l'œuvre et chaque mois apporte de nouvelles découvertes. On peut donc se demander si le moment était opportun pour composer un travail d'ensemble sur le xvi^{e} siècle. C'est ce que s'est proposé M. Guy: c'est un dessein courageux et désintéressé. Il sait bien qu'une telle histoire est sans doute condamnée à vieillir vite; mais il sait aussi qu'il est bon qu'un ouvrage général ne se fasse point trop attendre: il nous permet de nous rendre compte de l'état de la science et joue le rôle d'un inventaire périodique de nos connaissances. C'est bien ainsi, semble-t-il, que se présentera l'histoire de M. Guy. Mais ce premier volume est, et devait être, beaucoup plus que cela. Dans ces fouilles organisées de tous côtés dans notre xvi^{e} siècle, le

quartier des Rhétoriqueurs a été fort négligé. M. Guy n'a pas eu ici à réunir et à mettre au point les résultats obtenus par ses prédécesseurs. Il a dû fonder son travail sur les recherches auxquelles il se consacre depuis de longues années et faire œuvre originale. Sachons lui en gré. Il serait difficile en effet de trouver un terrain plus ingrat et une tâche plus rebutante. Dans cette école des Rhétoriqueurs, les hommes, sauf de rares exceptions, sont médiocres et, trop souvent, les œuvres présentent 'un modèle parfait de platitude sans défaillance,' le style n'est qu'un 'galimatias solennel, un idiome comique et monstrueux,' et de l'un d'eux (Jean Molinet) M. Guy va jusqu'à dire que 'si l'on ne connaissait pas la loyauté de ses intentions, on croirait qu'il a pris à tâche de rendre grotesques les choses qu'il célébrait.'

Il était légitime, néanmoins, d'étudier longuement ces pauvretés. D'abord à cause de l'admiration et de l'importance que les contemporains leur ont accordées; mais surtout parce qu'on ne doit point oublier 'que ces niaiseries ne disparurent pas avec les Rhétoriqueurs; ils les transmirent aux écoles suivantes.' Cette influence profonde et durable des Rhétoriqueurs, beaucoup la soupçonnaient, peu la connaissaient: M. Guy nous la dévoile, nette et précise. Laissons de côté Rabelais, qui s'était nourri des Rhétoriqueurs, où il a puisé mainte idée et maint procédé de langue et de style (cf. entre autres les §§ 190, 211, 298, 299, 347, 371, 435, 620). Mais, pour ne prendre qu'un exemple, Ronsard ne sera bien connu et compris qu'autant qu'on se rendra compte de ce qu'il doit, non pas seulement à C. Marot, ainsi que l'a si bien montré M. Laumonier, mais aussi aux Rhétoriqueurs dont il est loin de s'être complètement dégagé tout d'abord. M. Guy va plus loin encore: mais il est difficile de le suivre lorsqu'il écrit que 'considérée sous un certain angle, la réforme de Malherbe n'est qu'une restauration de la tyrannie des syllabes' (p. 100). La raison de Malherbe n'a guère rien de commun avec la raison des Rhétoriqueurs: elle s'appuie sur l'usage et le bon sens. L'école des Rhétoriqueurs méritait donc une étude longue, minutieuse et complète. M. Guy ne nous l'a point donnée. La grave difficulté dont il s'explique dans son avant-propos tient beaucoup au plan général qu'il a adopté. Qu'il nous permette d'exprimer le regret qu'il n'ait point franchement abordé le problème et qu'il s'en soit tenu à une demi-solution. Il a déterminé d'écrire une Histoire de la poésie au xvi^{e} siècle et il faut bien qu'il y comprenne les Rhétoriqueurs. Mais si cette école 's'est étendue sur tout le premier tiers de ce siècle, elle florissait (ou sévissait) bien avant qu'il commençât.' M. Guy se refuse à 'entreprendre, à propos du xvi^{e} siècle, l'examen du xv^{e} presque entier.' Il rejette la méthode 'arbitraire et puérile' qui consisterait à partir de l'an 1500. Il adopte un autre parti, celui de s'occuper uniquement des Rhétoriqueurs qui sont morts après 1500. La méthode est-elle moins arbitraire et moins puérile? Voyons ce qu'elle entraine. M. Guy divise son volume en trois livres: le premier traite des caractères généraux, le second et le troisième des grands et des petits Rhétoriqueurs. Le premier chapitre du premier livre est consacré aux sources. Il renferme un bref aperçu des origines de l'école et une légère esquisse

des principaux Rhétoriqueurs morts avant 1500. Il se trouve donc que Jean Meschinot est exécuté en deux pages et Georges Chastellain, le grand Georges, en quatre, tandis que Molinet, étant mort après 1500, aura à lui tout seul, dans le second livre, seize pages et André de la Vigne dix-sept! M. Guy nous dit bien que 'l'école des Rhétoriqueurs est restée avant, après 1500 immuable en ses tendances, obstinément fidèle à ses doctrines.' Il n'en est pas moins vrai que ce manque de proportion choque et qu'il est grand dommage que M. Guy se soit astreint à un plan qui l'obligeait à couper l'école en deux, à glisser aussi rapidement sur le xv^e^ siècle et à se contenter de 'rattacher à leurs prédécesseurs les auteurs qu'il se proposait d'étudier plus loin.'

Si nous nous montrons aussi difficiles, la faute en est à M. Guy lui-même. Il traite avec tant de talent la partie du sujet à laquelle il s'est volontairement limité, il égaye de tant d'esprit et de bonne humeur l'aridité de la matière, qu'il nous entraine à sa suite, intéressés et charmés, dans son voyage d'exploration parmi les broussailles épineuses de la Grande Rhétorique. Mais il éveille en notre esprit des curiosités nouvelles. Nous voyons combien les Rhétoriqueurs pénètrent avant dans le xvi^e^ siècle: nous aurions aimé qu'il nous retraçât avec autant de précision et de détail les origines de leur école. Le rapide aperçu que renferment les quatre ou cinq premières pages du premier chapitre de son ouvrage ne nous satisfait plus. Nous regrettons d'autant plus que M. Guy n'ait point entrepris cette enquête qu'il est le savant le mieux qualifié pour la mener à bien: nous ne renonçons pas à l'espoir qu'il veuille bien s'y occuper un jour.

Découper l'histoire d'une littérature en siècles est illusoire et stérile: la découper en genres ne l'est guère moins. M. Guy compose une histoire de la poésie française au xvi^e^ siècle. Il est amené à consacrer tout un volume aux Rhétoriqueurs. Or il se trouve que les Rhétoriqueurs 'ont fondé sur la confusion des genres, le genre qu'ils regardaient comme le plus magnifique.' Et leurs gros ouvrages sont, la plupart, un mélange de prose et de vers, où l'on ne saurait découvrir la moindre raison pourquoi ce qui est dit en vers ne l'est pas en prose, ni pourquoi ce qui est en prose n'est pas en vers. Comment donc justifier une méthode qui consiste à écarter la prose pour ne retenir que ce qui est rimé? Sans doute la règle de M. Guy n'est point de fer: elle cède et plie à l'occasion. Il en est réduit néanmoins à 'saluer en passant' une œuvre aussi considérable que les *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularités de Troye* de Jean Lemaire de Belges.

Tel qu'il est, l'ouvrage de M. Guy est précieux. Le premier livre nous fournit des renseignements beaucoup plus complets et plus sûrs que ceux dont nous disposions sur les centres artistiques au xv^e^ et au xvi^e^ siècle, sur la situation matérielle des écrivains et sur leurs mécènes. Nous aurions voulu des preuves plus convaincantes de l'importance que M. Guy accorde à Lyon, comme centre littéraire et artistique dès le xv^e^ siècle. Les chapitres sur la matière poétique et ses principaux ornements, sur les complications et les jeux rythmiques, sur les genres poétiques sont excellents. M. Guy conserve la distinction traditionnelle

entre les grands et les petits Rhétoriqueurs, mais il a soin de nous avertir qu'il sait combien elle est artificielle. Elle repose sur la faveur plus ou moins grande dont les Rhétoriqueurs ont joui auprès des puissants du jour et aussi, hélas! sur la quantité de leurs écrits plus que sur leur qualité. Les petits furent parfois supérieurs aux grands 'parce qu'ils ont eu la chance de travailler à l'écart, de s'affranchir au moins en partie des règles et des modes qui abêtissaient les prétendus habiles, les écrivains patentés!' Ce fut le cas de Jean Parmentier que M. Guy, à notre joie, s'est efforcé de réhabiliter.

L'exécution matérielle du livre est bonne. Le texte est clair et se présente bien; il est divisé en paragraphes numérotés; point de notes au bas des pages, donc point de chiffres et de renvois continuels qui sont une fatigue pour l'œil et pour l'esprit. Une bibliographie et des références suivent chaque chapitre. Il y aurait eu avantage à les reporter à la fin du volume, avant l'index des noms propres. Et si les sommaires placés en tête des chapitres avaient été incorporés à la table des matières, l'ouvrage eût été plus facile à consulter. Nous regrettons de ne point trouver dans la Bibliographie de Jean Marot l'étude vieillie mais si vivante de Prof. Henry Morley, publiée dans 'C. Marot and other Studies' (2 vols. 1871). Nous souhaitons que M. Guy ne nous fasse point longtemps attendre les autres volumes de son *Histoire*.

André Barbier.

Aberystwyth.

Del Rinnovamento d'Italia. Per Vincenzo Gioberti. A cura di Fausto Nicolini. (*Scrittori d'Italia,* xiv, xvi, xxiv.) Bari: G. Laterza e Figli. 8vo. 372 + 395 + 385 pp.

Lirici Marinisti. A cura di Benedetto Croce. (Same Series, i.) 559 pp.

Poesie di Iacopo Vittorelli. A cura di Attilio Simioni. (Same Series, xii.) 391 pp.

Le Maccheronee. Di Merlin Cocai (Teofilo Folengo). A cura di Alessandro Luzio. (Same Series, x, xix.) 352 + 373 pp.

So ambitious seemed the programme of this collection of Italian classics, that we delayed our criticism until, in Machiavelli's words, we had 'ferma esperienza' of the new venture. By now we presume that every reader, who takes even a cursory interest in Italian literature, will be convinced by reference to the volumes on his shelves, that Senatore Croce the promoter, Signor Nicolini the general editor of the series and the firm of Giuseppe Laterza e Figli ought to be congratulated on the success, which crowns most deservedly their enterprise. Twenty or even ten years ago such an undertaking would not have been thought of in Italy, or, if attempted, would have met with scant recognition. Books still found then a very limited market in the peninsula; and apart from the general improvement in social conditions, it is certainly

due to the disinterested labours of Italian scholars that the present revival has been made possible. The new fervour of political life is appropriately crowned by a more intense love for the old writers; and we may say without hesitation that this collection, by satisfying a need much felt, is in its department the crowning achievement of this literary revival. To our mind the search for old editions is often illogical. No doubt some original impressions are of considerable value to the student and may seem to an over-sensitive reader with their yellowish paper and faded type more attuned to the archaic style of the writers. But really valuable editions have risen of late to figures far beyond the reach of the average reader, while others, which are sought after on account of their date and bring high prices, are really worthless. Whereas we could not have a library edition more worthily printed, or more scholarly and accurate texts than those provided by this series. A whole army of editors, each a specialist in his field, have stood sponsors to these volumes; yet the editors have exercised such restraint that the reader is not troubled with a cumbersome critical apparatus or with lengthy introductory notes. They have almost entirely effaced their labours and liberally allowed the public to enjoy the results.

Out of the twenty odd volumes which have already been issued it seems fitting to consider first the work of one of the 'prophets' of the 'Risorgimento,' Vincenzo Gioberti. He had already written that thought-stirring book *Del primato civile degli Italiani*, had had a brief and unlucky spell of active political life as premier in the Piedmontese government of 1849, and had fled into voluntary exile to Paris, when, in 1851, he published the absorbing work which is here reprinted. The history of the 'Risorgimento' has been studied so intently of late that the reissue of this book cannot but be welcome. Previous editions are scarce or valueless. The present editor, Signor Nicolini, tells us of the remarkable success obtained by this book. We cannot wonder at it. We learn that even Victor Emanuel II, by no means a lover of books, carefully perused this one, which is steeped in the passionate atmosphere of those days. The devotion to Italy, almost religious in character, of Dante and Machiavel finds an echo in these pages, and Gioberti's stern and rather dogmatic forecasts, often verified by subsequent events, fill us with admiration for his genius. The editor's restraint has been perhaps carried too far; a few brief notes such as those added by Senatore Croce to volumes I and XI would have rendered fuller and easier the enjoyment of this work, to those who are not fully acquainted with the undercurrents and the minor episodes of the Italian revolution. The *Rinnovamento* was not a forgotten work, but in the case of other works in this collection the lack of recent reprints and the rarity of old editions have caused their authors to be all but forgotten. It is one of the values of the present collection that, by reprinting little known works, it will no doubt remedy this lamentable tendency. While the seventeenth century bids fair to regain popularity in painting and sculpture, it still suffers under Alfieri's sweeping judgment of it with regard to its literature: 'il seicento delirò.' Senatore Croce has himself

undertaken to prepare a large selection from the mass of lyrics of this period. The reader of his *Lirici Marinisti* will be pleasantly surprised by the subtle charm of some of these poems, most of which were hitherto practically unknown. The present editor, we fear, has somewhat overrated the value of these poets in his *Saggi di Letteratura Italiana del Seicento* (Bari, Laterza, 1910), but since he may claim to be their discoverer, he may have been blinded by a kind of paternal affection for them[1]. There are poems of very different value here, but on the whole we find ourselves amidst a revelry of captivating harmonies; haunting melodies accompany us while we skim the more 'euphuistic' specimens and we are arrested occasionally by lyrics which evince a deep and passionate understanding of nature. The essential qualities of these poets are fluency and melody, and a sensuous exaggeration of sounds, such as we readily connect with musical Italy of the seventeenth century. But even though we may not be wholly satisfied that Fontanella has claims to a higher rank than Marino, as Senatore Croce suggests, this volume makes it clear that the traditional valuation of seventeenth century authors requires to be readjusted, and that new studies might bear good fruit in this field[2].

The eighteenth shares with the preceding century a certain lack of favour among modern readers. Our great-grandmothers knew Metastasio by heart and adored Vittorelli; nowadays Metastasio is all too frequently dismissed without sufficient consideration and Vittorelli is ignored. The latter's poems now appear for the first time in a complete edition. Signor Simioni, who gave us five years ago a painstaking account of the poet's uneventful life[3], is perhaps more lavish in his praise than we might feel inclined to be. Vittorelli's muse was amazingly melodious when composing 'canzonette' or anacreontics, but his sonnets are loosely knitted and his satiric poems lack the point and the gravity of Parini's. After reading *Il Tupé*, *Il Naso*, or *I Maccheroni*, we go back with renewed pleasure to the 'canzonette.' A few unpublished poems are added to those which Vittorelli printed at divers times, but they certainly do not enhance his reputation.

The editing of works like Vittorelli's or Gioberti's does not offer very great difficulties, but Folengo's Latin poems make greater demands on the conscientious editor. Signor Luzio had given a good deal of his varied and brilliant activity to the solution of the many problems connected with Macheronic poetry. Folengo left four different renderings of his masterpiece; and the opinions which have been given of it have varied according to the edition which the critic preferred. De Sanctis did much to show the deep seriousness of this apparently irrepressible joker, probably because he had studied the *Baldus* in its fourth revision.

[1] Senatore Croce avoids however the exaggerations which are to be read in another book on the period, M. Rigillo, *Il Seicento e i Pregiudizi sul Secentismo*, Cagliari, 1907.

[2] Reference might be made to an interesting book by M. Gabriel Maugain, *Étude sur l'évolution intellectuelle de l'Italie de* 1657 *à* 1750 *environ*, Paris, Hachette, 1909.

[3] Attilio Simioni, *Iacopo Vittorelli, La Vita e gli Scritti*, Rocca S. Casciano, 1907 (Vol. VIII of the series *Indagini di storia letteraria e artistica*, dirette da Guido Mazzoni).

But later critics have held widely different views. Signor Luzio's editorial note will, we think, bring order into what has been chaos. Merlin Cocai was not only a consummate artist, an indefatigable chiseller of the strange language he chose, but also a man with a lofty conception of life, deeply humane and ever striving to bring about a moral reform by his humorous exposure of vice. He was so intensely earnest about his work that he submitted his *Baldus* to three revisions. The first edition (Venice, 1517–18) gives us the mere framework of the poem. This he revised and modified for the reprint of 1521 (Toscolana), which was the one known to Rabelais[1]; and he again improved upon it in the so-called Cipadense edition (probably 1539–40). He strove continuously to render his style more comic and more expressive, his representation of life more realistic, though with much praiseworthy restraint, and finally to give to the whole poem the polish of art. For a long time critics have refused to accept the authenticity of Folengo's poems in the form in which they were edited by Vigasio Coccaio (Venice, 1552); but Signor Luzio shows that this edition was the result of a final, if incomplete revision, but as far as it goes a most successful one. In the present reissue the text is taken from Vigasio's reprint. But in this admirable edition of Laterza nothing essential is omitted; all important various readings from the Cipadense are given in full; and also the amusing prefatory notes from the Tusculana are reprinted. The notes of the Tusculana are embodied in the glossary, so that all possible assistance is given to the student without causing annoyance to the general reader. It will indeed be surprising if this reprint does not encourage some further research into Folengo's life and works. Signor Luzio himself has given us a promise[2]. His suggestion that a youthful crime imputed to Giovan Ludovico Folengo should possibly be ascribed to Teofilo, may provide us with the key to the strain of sadness which pervades the works of this fitful and interesting writer.

C. Foligno.

Oxford.

Tristan und Isolde von Gottfried von Strassburg. Neu bearbeitet von Wilhelm Hertz. Sechste Auflage, mit einem Nachtrag von Wolfgang Golther. Stuttgart: Cotta. 1911. 8vo. 580 pp.

Wilhelm Hertz happily combined the qualities of a profound scholar with the genius of a true poet; his original lyric and epic verse and his adaptations of Old French and Middle High German poets are alike distinguished by perfection of form and language, by vivid intuition and an admirable plastic power. Most of these 'translations,' using the word in its widest sense, are supplemented by introductions and explanatory notes which sum up in an able manner the results of

[1] Vol. II, p. 363, where reference to other authorities is given.

[2] In the review he wrote of Signor Biondolillo's book in the *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, LVIII (1911), pp. 392–93.

scholarly research. It is obvious that these additions have to be revised from time to time according to the advance of our knowledge, while the translation must retain the form given to it by the poet himself. It is in this manner that G. Rosenhagen treated Hertz's adaptation of the *Parzival* of Wolfram von Eschenbach, and that W. Golther now deals with Hertz's *Tristan*. But what Golther has done here is to reproduce in full Hertz's comments and to add a short supplement to them. We cannot altogether approve of this method, especially with regard to the work in question. Research into the origin and the complicated development of the Tristan saga, and particularly into the sources of the Middle High German poem, has been much influenced since the death of Hertz by the critical editions of the French Tristan epics (cp. E. Muret, *Le roman de Tristan par Béroul et un anonyme*, 1903, and J. Bédier, *Le roman de Tristan par Thomas*, 1902 and 1905); and it has been proved that both these poems and all known poems on Tristan go back to a French prose romance of the middle of the twelfth century, which has not been preserved. Whoever compares the different poetic forms of the Tristan saga now has to refer to this common source. But Golther merely corrects the main lines of Hertz's deductions and reproduces in their original form the 146 notes, which are now to a considerable extent antiquated. We think that Hertz himself would not have agreed with so reverential a method of treatment. Note 25 quotes Bédier's *Spécimen*, although the complete edition might now be referred to; and note 1 cites Golther's earlier papers on the Tristan saga, while his excellent book *Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, Leipzig, 1907, which supplants the former, is only mentioned in a supplementary note. We hope that Hertz's *Tristan* will be reprinted again and again, but we hope, too, that the explanatory part of the book will be recast in a form which will meet the approval of scholars.

ROBERT PETSCH.

LIVERPOOL.

Das Oxforder Buch deutscher Dichtung vom zwölften bis zum zwanzigsten Jahrhundert. Herausgegeben von H. G. FIEDLER. Mit einem Geleitwort von GERHART HAUPTMANN. Oxford: University Press. 8vo. xii + 596 pp.

The inclusion of a volume devoted to German poetry in the attractive series of Oxford Books of Poetry was obviously only a question of time; for by general consent the literature of Germany is better adapted than any other modern literature to have its most precious essence distilled in an anthology of this kind. And may it not also be claimed for German lyric poetry that it is—we will not say the greatest in the world, for lyric poetry is so intimately personal and national an art that every right-feeling nation must perforce regard its own as the greatest in the world—but as the

supreme and predominating element in German literature, the most intimate expression of the nation's temperament?

The present volume has but a brief preface by the editor; we might have preferred a lengthier introduction, more in the manner of the introductions to the earlier volumes of the series; but perhaps Professor Fiedler felt that this would have meant curtailing unduly the poetry itself; and after all, that is the main thing. On the other hand, we think the 'Geleitwort' by Dr Gerhart Hauptmann, who evidently had great difficulty in finding anything to say at all, might have easily been dispensed with.

With regard to the selection of lyrics, it is difficult a little to criticise, and criticism is hardly in place; for obviously everyone will have his own ideas as to what should and what should not be included in a book that he regards as a personal friend. And in German poetry the task is doubly difficult, as the range of great poetry to choose from is so enormously wide. From the purely English point of view the objection might be raised that the selection has been guided rather by what a cultured German reader considers his great poetry than by what we in England appreciate as great German poetry; but this is, no doubt, an extremely delicate point to settle. In an anthology of English poetry published in Germany we should naturally look for a much larger representation of Byron and a much smaller representation of Wordsworth than the English reader would demand; in the same way, it would be reasonable to look for similar modifications in a German anthology published in England. We are not sure if Professor Fiedler has sufficiently kept this consideration in view. On the whole, however, he has chosen wisely, and probably most readers will have little fault to find with the compromise he has made between the demands of the many-headed public and his own personal taste.

The difficulty of selection has been increased by the fact that the editor has elected to make his volume an anthology, not merely of lyric poetry, but of poetry in general, including often verse in which the lyric element is hardly present at all. The collection would, we think, have left a more self-contained impression had it been restricted to purely lyric poetry. There seems, for instance, little justification for including in such an anthology the 'Fable of the Rings' from Lessing's *Nathan*. The wideness of Professor Fiedler's net has also led to his devoting no less than sixty-six pages to Schiller, who can only be called a lyric poet in a modified and limited sense, while the most many-voiced of all modern lyric poets, Goethe, has only forty-two. We think, especially in a case like this, Professor Fiedler would have done well to keep in view the consideration of English versus German taste, to which we have referred. The selection from Goethe's poetry, however, seems to us a particularly happy one, and could hardly have been improved upon.

The poets of the nineteenth century are well represented. Here, again, if we might express a purely personal taste, we should have liked a greater variety, not of authors, but of kinds of poetry; the

business of a good anthology is not only to give us a nation's great poetry, but to show the width of range of such great poetry. There is a tendency to harp unduly on two lyric strains, which, no doubt, are prominent in the modern German lyric, but are far from being so much so as they are in this volume; we mean what we might call the sentimental-domestic strain, on the one hand, and the patriotic-warlike on the other. We are not always in agreement with Professor Fiedler's selection from quite modern writers such as Nietzsche and Dehmel; but here again the criterion is one of personal taste. We presume that Stefan George is absent from the collection owing to his well-known antipathy to appearing in anthologies.

The notes are not overladen with explanatory matter, as should be the case in a volume of this kind; and what is said is to the point. A valuable feature is the indication of the composers by whom the songs have been set. In this connection, Richard Strauss has composed for men's voices the *Schlachtlied*, No. 26; and one is tempted to suggest that a lyric from Rückert's wonderful *Kindertotenlieder* might have been included to allow Gustav Mahler's name to appear among the composers.

J. G. Robertson.

London.

Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit. Ein Schilderung der deutschen Literatur der letzten Jahrzehnte. Von Albert Soergel. Leipzig: R. Voigtländer. 1911. 8vo. xii + 892 pp.

Literatur in Deutschland. Studien und Eindrücke. Von Kurt Martens. Berlin: Egon Fleischel und Co. 1910. 8vo. 193 pp.

Masks and Minstrels of New Germany. By Percival Pollard. London: W. Heinemann. 1911. 8vo. viii + 299 pp.

Die Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur seit 1830. Von Georg Witkowski. Leipzig: R. Voigtländer. 1912. 8vo. vi + 165 pp.

The past four decades of the new German Empire will be associated in future histories of literature with keen conflicts between antagonistic literary opinions and persistent endeavours to get at the real problems and the true ideals of literary production. The comprehensive work of Albert Soergel is a valuable attempt to trace the various stages of the recent development, both in its theory and in its practice; Kurt Martens, himself a poet of considerable standing, gives us a series of studies of individual problems and authors, with which we may not always agree, for example, with the high praise he bestows on Helene Böhlau, but the lucid style of Martens' book, and the marked personality of the author, give it a peculiar charm; Georg Witkowski, who is well known as a historian of literature, discusses the

development of German literature since 1830. Lastly, Percival Pollard is an enthusiastic impressionist whose interest lies in the 'lighter muse' and her chief prophet Otto Julius Bierbaum.

The beginning of the new movement was marked by a complete break with tradition. Karl Bleibtreu's *Revolution der Literatur* strikes the keynote. But for their new ideals the younger German writers had to look abroad; they turned to France, to Balzac's *Comédie humaine,* to Flaubert and to the brothers Goncourt and their 'style impressioniste.' *Germinie Lacerteux* (1864) introduced the new social *milieu* into literature, and Emile Zola, their disciple, broadened the realistic social basis to naturalism *sans phrase.* Zola's *Rougon-Macquart* cycle became a kind of fetish to the first generation of these German writers. Soergel deals clearly with this development and with the theory and method of the 'roman expérimental': but something might also have been said for the influence of Darwin, Russel Wallace and, at a later date, Haeckel on literature.

It was only natural that, with the French example before them, these young writers should have first turned to the novel; that form of literature also afforded the best facilities for illustrating their theories. As to the theories themselves, it might be pointed out that they were not essentially foreign to the trend of German thought in the seventies and eighties; as Windelband[1] has shown, this was a time of 'wertlose und geschichtslose Weltanschauung' which followed the breakdown of German idealism in the fifties. The distinguishing marks of these decades were positivism, psychological analysis and a preponderating interest in the historical point of view, the last being represented in literature by Wildenbruch, the contemporary of Treitschke. The philosophic basis of the new movement has, it seems to us, been unduly neglected by Soergel.

At the beginning of this period there were two main literary centres, Munich and Berlin. The chief organ of the Munich poets was *Die Gesellschaft,* edited by their leader, M. G. Conrad, whose personality reminds us of the 'Kraftgenies' of the eighteenth century. The Berlin group of poets, whose leader was Heinrich Hart, were less united in their views. Heinrich Hart and his brother Julius published in 1882 their *Kritische Waffengänge,* in which they opposed the excessive admiration of Zola; but the latter's influence on both the German lyric and the German novel was considerable. Hermann Conradi, who unfortunately died early, was the most promising member of the group; and Karl Henckell wrote lyrics of some merit, although he never rose to the grand passion of a Herwegh. Heinrich Hart, although also lyrically gifted, is mainly important as a critic; he was the first to give expression to the ethic and aesthetic doctrines of the new time. In fiction there was nothing of importance, and Max Kretzer strove in vain to be the German Zola.

An important literary event in 1886 was the formation of the society 'Durch,' of which Eugen Wolff was one of the founders. It

[1] *Die Philosophie im deutschen Geistesleben des* 19*ten Jahrhunderts,* Tübingen, 1909.

was Wolff who gave the name 'die Moderne' to the new movement, which set up as its models Tolstoi, Dostoevski and Ibsen and thereby accentuated the ethical and psychological problems. The modern drama was banned from the ordinary theatres, and a new home was formed for it in the so-called 'Freie Bühne,' amongst the founders of which were Otto Brahm and Paul Schlenther. The 'Freie Bühne' opened with Ibsen's *Ghosts*, and on October 28, 1889, Gerhart Hauptmann's *Vor Sonnenaufgang* followed in a performance accompanied by stormy scenes. This play was dedicated to Arno Holz, the chief prophet of 'consequent naturalism,' whose theoretical views had a great influence on the art of the theatre. As a poet, Holz was but mediocrely gifted. Naturalism is closely allied with socialism, as is to be seen in the literature of this time; but socialism also contains the germs of individualism and anarchism, a development which is conspicuous in John Henry Mackay, an eclectic lyric poet of Scottish origin. Even still more of an eclectic is Ferdinand Avenarius, who endeavoured to spread literary taste in his *Kunstwart*, and to whom we owe one of the best anthologies of German lyric poetry.

A higher standard is reached by the novelists; by W. Bölsche, who, however, is better known by his popular scientific works; by Clara Viebig, a powerful writer of unflinching psychological insight, whose later works, however, show a remarkable falling-off; and by Ludwig Thoma, a South German satirist, who has given us a convincing picture of Bavarian peasant life in his *Andreas Vöst*. Higher than these stands Wilhelm von Polenz, the author of *Der Büttnerbauer*; and highest of all, Theodor Fontane, from whose *Irrungen, Wirrungen* Soergel reprints a scene which gives a good idea of the beauty of that work. In the drama the first place belongs to Gerhart Hauptmann. In his analysis and appreciation of Hauptmann's plays to 1898, Soergel does not appear to have advanced beyond the standpoint of Schlenther in his biography of Hauptmann[1]; he underestimates *Die Jungfern vom Bischofsberg*, and misunderstands the profound psychology of *Kaiser Karls Geisel*. Soergel only mentions the title of Hauptmann's last drama, *Die Ratten*, which again shows Hauptmann's strength in psychological analysis, and contains, in Frau John, the most successfully drawn of Hauptmann's women. Interesting is Soergel's brief criticism of the rhythm of Hauptmann's language, in which he comes to the conclusion that *Der arme Heinrich* represents 'die Höhe von Hauptmanns Verskunst.' Soergel gives a clear analysis of Hauptmann's novel *Emanuel Quint*, but he might with advantage also have shown how intimately the book is connected with Hauptmann's earlier work. The other dramatists of this period are satisfactorily dealt with; only O. E. Hartleben, of whose personality Pollard gives a more sympathetic picture, seems somewhat undervalued; *Hanna Jagert*, with all its lack of concentration, is a play of considerable literary value.

In Hauptmann's work there are tendencies which point towards

[1] Cp. Robert Petsch, *Gerhart Hauptmann, die Tragödie des 19. Jahrhunderts*, in Ilberg's *Neue Jahrbücher* etc., vol. xxi, p. 542 ff.

an abandonment of naturalism; and the theoretical grounds for this abandonment are—though superficially—set forth by Richard Dehmel in his essay on the German 'Alltagstragödie.' The new impulse came again from Romance countries, from Huysmans, Verlaine, Maupassant, Verhaeren, D'Annunzio, Maeterlinck; but the greatest anti-naturalist is himself a German, Friedrich Nietzsche. The centre of this new movement is Vienna, a city where literary traditions were strong and where naturalism had never had much hold. Here the chief dramatists are Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Beer-Hofmann. Greater than the latter is Schmidtbonn, who in his *Graf von Gleichen* has created a play of great beauty and psychological depth, which promises well for his future.

In lyric poetry it is unnecessary to dwell on the originality of Detlev von Liliencron. His influence on his many followers, such as Gustav Falke and Karl Busse, has fostered a kind of unoriginal eclecticism; and to these eclectics must also be reckoned, in spite of Pollard's exaggerated claims for him, Otto Julius Bierbaum. Bierbaum is a pleasant *causeur*, a humourist with an exquisite artistic sense whose style and character are best illustrated by his last publication, *Yankeedoodlefahrt*.

It is difficult to bring the lyric poetry of the time under a single heading. One group of poets is gathered round Arno Holz, with his new ideals of rhymeless verse and his extreme naturalism; others follow Stefan George and form the antipodes of naturalism in their devotion to a formalism that goes back to romantic poets like Hölderlin. Baudelaire, Verlaine and especially the English Pre-Raphaelites are the models of this group; while the symbolism of Maeterlinck is exaggerated to an often incomprehensible mysticism in Mombert and becomes grotesque and fantastic in Paul Scheerbart. All these tendencies in the lyric meet in the poetic individuality of Richard Dehmel—with Liliencron, the greatest modern lyric poet—whose excess of sentiment, however, sometimes leads to exaggeration.

It is difficult to find a single label for the last decade of German literature, 1900—1910; its general aspect and tendencies are too varied, the renaissance of German idealism being perhaps the most characteristic. A lyric poet like Rainer Maria Rilke has naturally some connection with Stefan George, but his Angelus Silesius-like mysticism marks out for him a field peculiarly his own. On the other hand, Arno Holz's theories are to be traced in the work of Otto zur Linde and the 'Charon' poets, although not to the exclusion of individual aims on the part of these writers. 'Back to the primitive' is the motto of this time, that revives Indian 'Schattenspiele' and discovers the original source of poetry in rhythm. An interest is at the same time awakened for a writer whom we regard as the greatest epic poet of modern Germany, Carl Spitteler.

The novel continues to be influenced by romantic and foreign models, French, Russian, Scandinavian, English. Characteristic of it, too, is the 'Los von Berlin' movement, that is to say, the tendency

of decentralisation and the revival of a 'Heimatkunst.' The prophets of this movement are Fritz Lienhart and Adolf Bartels, who, however, have little claim to be regarded as original writers. The novel is much cultivated in South Germany and Austria, but it has not succeeded in arriving at any great achievement. Emil Strauss and Hermann Hesse seem to us unduly praised. In connection with the latter Ludwig Finkh ought to have been mentioned; his *Rosendoktor* has much in common with Hesse's *Peter Camenzind*; and something might also have been said about the Weinheim physician Carillon. The most gifted of the group seems to us Bernhard Kellermann. This writer may not yet have found his final artistic form, but his last novel *Das Meer* is full of high promise. Notable among the North German writers is Georg Hermann, whose *Jettchen Gebert* is, undoubtedly, one of the best modern German novels.

The brothers Heinrich and Thomas Mann occupy a position by themselves. Martens is more penetrating in his characterisation of them, Soergel the more comprehensive. The latter points to the influence of Thackeray on Thomas Mann, but he might easily have said more on this point. Possibly there is also an influence of Ibsen on *Buddenbrooks*, the best German novel of the last decade. The other novelists of the time are adequately treated by Soergel, but some mention might have been made of Wette, as well as of G. O. Knoop, who is sympathetically appreciated by Martens. Among the names which Soergel mentions in the introduction to the drama of this period, a few might have been more fully discussed such as Eduard Stucken, Heinrich Lilienfein, a dramatist of real talent, and Friedrich Freksa.

How unsettled aesthetic taste in Germany was at the beginning of the last decade is seen in the adaptation of the French Montmartre cabaret as the German 'Überbrettl,' in which Pollard finds so much to praise. But in its aesthetic pretensions the 'Überbrettl' seems to us to have been an utter failure. One of its chief personalities is Frank Wedekind, of whom Martens gives an excellent characterisation; and Wedekind, with all his extravagances a really gifted dramatist, has outlived the 'Überbrettl.' Of Karl Schönherr and Fritz Stavenhagen, the latter seems to us to have been the more original; one cannot regard Schönherr's *Glaube und Heimat* as *the* great tragedy, but Stavenhagen had, in our opinion, given promise of filling a long felt gap in German comedy. There is, further, a neo-romantic and a neo-classic group of poets. To the former belongs Ernst Hardt, whose *Tantris der Narr* never surely deserved the 'Schillerpreis'; to the latter belong Paul Ernst, Wilhelm von Scholz and others. But they are all merely eclectics and experimentalists. Soergel, as well as Martens, concludes with a study on that promising young dramatist Herbert Eulenberg.

Something might have been said on the subject of literary theories in the period under consideration, a matter which is well and fully treated by Soergel; and we must certainly not omit to express our gratitude for the many and well-chosen illustrations in his book.

An index of the artists would be useful in a second edition, where, too, the style might be improved here and there and the numerous misprints corrected.

Professor Witkowski's *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur seit* 1830 is not, he tells us, intended to compete with other histories of modern German literature; its particular aim is 'den Lesern Hilfe bei der Wahl der Bücher und zum Genuss und Urteil zu bieten.' But he has by no means restricted himself to this purpose; his lucid treatise strikes out new paths and brings vividly before us the literary development since 1830. The important stages are well defined and due attention given to the various foreign influences. His characterisation of individual authors and of the general trend of thought within special periods is concise and suggestive, although, owing to the limitations of space, naturally somewhat dogmatic. We note particularly the warm appreciation of Lenau and Spitteler, the impartial estimate of Ferdinand Avenarius, the clear discussion of realism (pp. 35 ff.) and of the 'Zeitstimmung' after 1850 (pp. 43 ff.). There are only a few points in which we differ from Professor Witkowski, as, for instance, his too severe criticism of Hugo von Hofmannsthal; we should have wished, too, for a more ample treatment of Wilhelm von Polenz, and surely Vischer's novel *Auch Einer* ought to have been mentioned in the text. The book is supplied with elaborate and valuable notes, which include even so recent a date as the death of Felix Dahn last January. Perhaps it might be added to p. 51 that Adolf Hausrath died some years ago; on p. 64 reference might have been made to the excellent essay by O. F. Walzel on Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach (*Aufsätze*, 1811), and on p. 131 to the book by Kurt Martens which has just been reviewed. But these are trifles. The book leaves the impression on us that Witkowski is singularly well equipped for the task he has undertaken.

KARL HOLL.

LIVERPOOL.

MINOR NOTICES.

The first part (*Inferno*) of this useful work (*Dante's Divina Commedia*, edited and annotated by C. H. Grandgent. London: D. C. Heath and Co.) was reviewed in these pages rather more than a year ago (Vol. v, pp. 124—6). Professor Grandgent now gives us the *Purgatorio* on the same plan. As the previous volume was noticed at some length, we will confine ourselves on the present occasion to a few remarks suggested in the course of a first reading. In a note on I. 19—21, the editor gives a reference to Dr Moore's article in this *Review* (Vol. III, pp. 376 ff.) on the almanack of Profacius, but he omits to mention the all-important point that by the discovery of this

almanack the chief obstacle to the acceptance of the year 1300 as the date of Dante's vision has been removed. The objection, or one of the objections, to taking *indico legno* (VII, 74) to be amber, and not indigo, as is usually supposed, is that yellow is already represented by *oro* (l. 73), and that blue is wanted to complete the colour-gamut. *Vista* (X, 67) is used, we think, in the sense of 'aperture,' as in *Inf.* X, 52 (here 'window'), rather than in that of 'view point,' 'outlook.' In the argument to canto XII, where Professor Grandgent draws attention to the fivefold repetition of the initials VOM in the terzine comprised in ll. 25—63, he fails to note the suggestion as to the peculiar significance of the word thus formed (namely *uom*, i.e. 'man') which is recorded in Dr Moore's *Studies in Dante* (II, 268). In the note on XXIV, 30, we are told that Dante's use of the term *rocco* for the pastoral staff of the Archbishop of Ravenna is 'unexplained.' It was explained by one of the earliest of the commentators on the *Commedia*, viz. Jacopo della Lana, whose explanation is given in the *Dante Dictionary* (s.v. *Bonifazio*[2]), with a reference to a work of Corrado Ricci, in which there is an illustration of the very *rocco* mentioned by Dante. Ananias and Sapphira are stated (XX, 112) to have sold a piece of land 'belonging to the apostles'; but the 'possession' was their own, as is clear from the words of Peter to Ananias (*Acts* V, 4).

Professor Grandgent has profited by our previous remarks to the extent of recognizing later editions of some of the commentaries of which he has made use; but the glaring misprint '*Via Nuova*' to which we drew attention still disfigures the page of abbreviations. The only other misprint we have noticed is *Ugguccione* on p. 227. An excellent feature of the work, which we omitted to mention in our former review, is the list of authorities at the end of the 'argument' to each canto. We are glad to see a reference to Mr W. H. V. Reade's *Moral System of Dante's Inferno*, an original contribution to Dantesque literature which is not so well known to Dantists outside this country as it should be. In a future issue a reference might be added (on p. 179) to the two suggestive articles on Dante and Statius contributed by Dr A. W. Verrall to the *Independent Review* for Nov. 1903 ('To follow the Fisherman') and the *Albany Review* for August 1908 ('Dante on the Baptism of Statius'), with which Professor Grandgent does not seem to be acquainted.

P. T.

It is obviously somewhat late to discuss now the merits and shortcomings of Mr Collison-Morley's *Giuseppe Baretti with an account of his Literary Friendships and Feuds in Italy and in England in the days of Dr Johnson* (London: John Murray, 1909), especially since a very full review of it has appeared from the pen of Luigi Piccioni (*Giornale storico della Letteratura italiana*, LVII, pp. 94 ff.), one of the most competent authorities on this subject. The author does not lay any claim to first-hand research about Baretti's Italian life, so that for

the scholar a considerable portion of the book is of little value, being merely founded on works published in Italy. Mr Marion Crawford, who supplied the preface, thought Italians too prone to forget that a great part of Baretti's life was spent in England, and even more that much of his literary work was written in a language which he possessed almost to perfection. There may be some exaggeration in this; yet there was certainly room for a good work on Baretti's life in England. Unfortunately the author has not felt the need of much independent investigation, so that, notwithstanding a certain number of fresh facts which he supplies, he cannot be said to have exhausted the subject and to have rendered further discoveries improbable. As Baretti was connected with Dr Johnson, Mrs Thrale and their friends, there was a certain inducement to draw into the work much that was not essential to it; nor has the author always withstood the inducement. So that from a mere scholar's point of view the critic's verdict would not go in favour of the present work. It would, however, be decidedly unfair to consider the book solely from such a standpoint, as it aims at bringing to the notice of a wider range of readers the life and works of a writer who possessed three living languages, who had an undeniable influence on the development of Italian literature and who did not shrink from attacking Voltaire in defence of Shakespeare. This book provides the general reader, or at least the reader interested in literary history, with a considerable amount of information in agreeable form.

C. F.

From the Oxford University Press we have two interesting and useful reprints, *Burns, Poems published in* 1786, a type-facsimile reproduction of the Kilmarnock edition, and *Lyrical Ballads*, 1798, edited, with an introductory note, by Professor Littledale. These two books are among the landmarks in the history of English poetry, and it is a great thing for students of literature to have them available in a trustworthy form and at a reasonable price. In order to appreciate the effect which was produced upon contemporary readers we must make sure that we know precisely what the contents of the volumes were, and for this purpose nothing will take the place of the books themselves; for apart from the question of differences of text, we can never satisfactorily reconstruct them by picking out the poems which composed them out of the collection of the author's works. It is true that we already have two reprints of the *Lyrical Ballads*, and both Mr Hutchinson's and Professor Dowden's are valuable books for the editorial matter which they contain; but the new Oxford edition is cheaper than either, and the text after all is the main thing.

G. C. M.

Mr Maurice Hare edits a reprint of Chatterton's Rowley Poems from Tyrwhitt's edition (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911), with the Appendix which was added in 1778, 'containing some observations upon

the language of the poems attributed to Rowley, tending to prove that they were written, not by any ancient author, but entirely by Thomas Chatterton.' Mr Hare gives us a biography of Chatterton and an account of the genesis of the Rowley poems, which are fairly satisfactory, but his literary criticism is not of much independent value, and from remarks casually thrown out one gathers that he has rather misty ideas both of the manners of the Middle Ages and of the literary tendencies of the eighteenth century. Moreover, such expressions as 'very interested' are not yet good English.

The text is printed page for page from Tyrwhitt's, and is an excellent reproduction of the original as regards form and type: the Glossary is Tyrwhitt's also, but with additions by the present editor. It may be noted that though the editor has corrected some of the false references, yet some still remain, as for example under the headings 'Adave,' 'After la goure,' 'Behight,' 'Geer.' Tyrwhitt's Appendix is an excellent piece of criticism, and though the examination which it contains of the language of the Rowley poems has been further developed in our own time, the author was fully justified in claiming that he had proved his case. The motto from Virgil which stands upon the title-page of this Appendix was finely selected:

> Tum levis haud ultra latebras jam quærit imago,
> Sed sublime volans nocti se immiscuit atræ.

G. C. M.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

March—May, 1912.

GENERAL.

Arnold, R. F., Das moderne Drama. 2nd ed. Strassburg. Trübner. 6 M.

Bastide, C., Anglais et Français du xvii^e^ siècle. Paris, Alcan. 4 fr.

Festschrift, Vilhelm Thomsen zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 10 M.

Finsler, G., Homer in der Neuzeit von Dante bis Goethe. Italien, Frankreich, England, Deutschland. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 M.

Hall, H. M., Idylls of Fishermen. A History of the Literary Species (Columbia Univ. Studies in Comparative Literature). New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1 dol. 50.

Hinneberg, P., Die Kultur der Gegenwart, herausg. von. 2nd edition. i, i, Die allgemeinen Grundlagen der Kultur der Gegenwart. Leipzig, Teubner. 18 M.

Holl, K., Zur Geschichte der Lustspieltheorie. i. Entwicklungsgeschichte, in Einzelvertretern dargestellt bis Gottsched. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, xliv.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M. 20.

Jespersen, O., Elementarbuch der Phonetik. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M. 60.

Lalo, C., Introduction à l'esthétique. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Neilson, W. A., The Essentials of Poetry. London, Constable. 5*s.* net.

Sievers, E., Rhythmisch-melodische Studien. Vorträge und Aufsätze. (Germanische Bibliothek, ii. Abt., v.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 20.

Tyroller, F., Die Fabel von dem Mann und dem Vogel in ihrer Verbreitung in der Weltliteratur. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, li.) Berlin, E. Felber. 10 M.

Woodberry, G. E., Great writers : Cervantes, Scott, Milton, Virgil, Montaigne, Shakespeare. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Woodberry, G. E., The Torch. Eight lectures on Race power in Literature. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Alexander, L. H., Participial Substantives of the -ata Type in the Romance Languages with special reference to French (Columbia Univ. Studies in Romance Philology and Literature). New York, Columbia Univ. Press.

Bibliotheca romanica. 146—148. Boccaccio, Il Filostrato ; 149—150. Salas Barbadillo, Alonso Jerónimo : Novelas. La hija de Celestina. La ingeniosa Elena ; 151—153. Cervantes Saavedra, Don Quijote (1, b.) ; Boccaccio, Il Corbaccio o il laberinto d' amore. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each number 40 pf.

Schröder, T., Die dramatischen Bearbeitungen der Don Juan-Sage in Spanien, Italien und Frankreich bis auf Molière einschliesslich. (Zeitschrift für roman. Phil., Beihefte, xxxvi.) Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Latin.

Frischlinus, N., Julius redivivus. Herausg. von W. Janell. (Lateinische Literaturdenkmale des xv. und xvi. Jahrh., xix.) Berlin, Wiedmann. 5 M.

Historia septem sapientum. i. Eine bisher unbekannte lateinische Übersetzung einer orientalischen Fassung der sieben weisen Meister (Mischle Sendabar), herausg. von A. Hilka. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, iv.) Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M. 20.

Schneiderhan, J., Roswitha von Gandersheim, die erste deutsche Dichterin. Paderborn, Bonifacius-Druckerei. 3 M. 30.

Vollert, K., Zur Geschichte der lateinischen Facetiensammlungen des xv. und xvi. Jahrhunderts. (Palaestra, cxiii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 60.

Werner, J., Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sinnsprüche des Mittelalters. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, iii.) Heidelberg, Winter. 2 M. 20.

Italian.

Azzolina, L., Il mondo cavalleresco in Bojardo, Ariosto e Berni. Palermo, A. Reber. 3 L.

Burgos, C. de, G. Leopardi, Su vida y sus obras. 2 vols. Valencia, Sempere. 6 pes.

Busnelli, G., Il concetto e l' ordine del Paradiso dantesco. ii. (Collezione di opuscoli danteschi inediti o rari, 110—113.) Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 3 L. 20.

Carducci, G., Opere. Edizione popolare. i. Juvenilia (1850—60). ii. Rime nuove (1861—87). Bologna, Zanichelli. Each 2 L. 50.

Cavalcanti, G., Sonnets and Ballate. With Translations and an Introduction by E. Pound. London, Swift. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Cecchi, E., La poesia di Giovanni Pascoli: saggio critico. Naples, Ricciardi. 2 L.

Dorini, U., Contributi alla biografia di Dante; la condizione economica del poeta e della famiglia: documenti e note. Florence, G. Carnesecchi. 5 L.

Franzoni, A. and Turchi, E., Per lo studio di Dante. i. Vita di Dante. ii. Preparazione allo studio di Dante. Rome, Soc. editr. Dante Alighieri. 1 L. 25.

Ladenarda, F. E., Feticisti Carduccini, con lettere di M. Rapisardi e P. Gauthiez. Palermo, G. Pedone-Lauriel. 3 L. 50.

Mazzini, G., Scritti e ricordi autobiografici: scelta con note storiche a cura di A. Donati. Rome, Soc. editr. Dante Alighieri. 3 L.

Passerini, G. L., Il vocabolario della poesia dannunziana. Con una epistola a G. D' Annunzio. Florence, Sansoni. 4 L.

Poliziano, A., Le stanze, l' Orfeo e le rime rivedute da G. Carducci. 2da ediz. a cura di G. Mazzoni e G. Rossi. Bologna, Zanichelli. 10 L.

Schmelzer, H., Petrarcas Verhältnis zur vorausgehenden christlichen Philosophie des Abendlandes. (Renaissance und Philosophie, vi.) Bonn, P. Hanstein. 1 M. 50.

Villari, P., Scritti vari. Bologna, Zanichelli. 5 L.

Zanella, G., Poesie, con prefazione di A. Graf. Nuova ediz. 2 vols. Florence, Le Monnier. 4 L.

Rhaeto-romanic.

Decurtius, C., Rätoromanische Chrestomathie. iv. Band. Surselvisch, Subselvisch, Volksmedizin, Nachträge. Erlangen, F. Junge. 36 M.

Provençal.

Chaytor, H. J., The Troubadours. (Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

La Salle de Rochemaure, Duc de, Les troubadours cantaliens du xii^e^ au xx^e^ siècle. 2 vols. (Bibl. régionaliste.) Paris, Bloud. 7 fr.

Pagès, A., Aunias March et ses prédécesseurs. Essai sur la poésie amoureuse et philosophique en Catalogne aux xiv^e^ et xv^e^ siècles. (Bibl. de l'École des hautes-études, fasc. 194.) Paris, Champion. 10 fr. 50.

Spanish.

Adam, J., Übersetzung und Glossar des altspanischen Poema del Cid. (Aus 'Romanische Forschungen.') Erlangen, F. Junge. 6 M.

Cotarelo y Mori, E., Don Francisco de Rojas Zorilla. Noticias bibliográficas y biográficas. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 4 pes.

Menéndez Pidal, R., Cantar de Mio Cid. Texto, gramática y vocabulario. iii. Madrid, Bailly-Baillière. 10 pes.

Torres Villarroel, Vida, ed. F. de Onis (Clasicos Castellanos, vii). Madrid, Ediciones de 'La Lectura' (Paris, Champion). 4 pes.

French.

(*a*) *General.*

Balcke, C., Der anorganische Nasallaut im Französischen. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Beihefte, xxxix.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Wright, C. H. C., A History of French Literature. New York, Oxford Univ. Press (London, H. Frowde). 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Adam le Bossu, trouvère artésien du xiii^e^ siècle. Le jeu de la Feuillée, ed. par E. Langlois. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr.

Bédier, J., Les chansons de Colin Muset, transcription des mélodies par J. Beck. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, Champion. 1 fr. 50.

Chansonnier, Le, de l'Arsenal. Trouvères des xii^e^ et xiii^e^ siècles, reproduits du manuscrit de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. Transcription du texte musical en notation moderne par P. Aubry, introd. et notices par A. Jeanroy. Fasc. 8 et 9. Paris, P. Genthner. 20 fr.

Ott, A. C., Das altfranzösische Eustachiusleben der Pariser Handschrift Nat. Bibl. fr. 1374, zum ersten Male mit Einleitung, den lateinischen Texten der 'Acta Sanctorum' und der 'Bibliotheca Casinensis,' Anmerkungen und Glossar herausg. (Aus 'Romanische Forschungen.') Erlangen, F. Junge. 4 M.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Allem, M., Alfred de Vigny (La vie anecdotique et pittoresque des grands écrivains). Paris, L. Michaud. 2 fr. 25.

Allem, M., L'épopée napoléonienne dans la poésie française. Textes choisis et annotés. Paris, Libr. des Annales. 7 fr.

Balzac, H. de, La comédie humaine, texte revisé et annoté par M. Bouteron et H. Longnon. Tome i, ii. Paris, L. Conard. Each 9 fr.

Bayle, P., Pensées diverses sur la comète, édit. critique avec introd. et notes par A. Prat. Tome i. (Société des textes français modernes.) Paris, E. Cornély. 6 fr.

Bernard, G., L'imitation espagnole en France. Les modèles castillans de nos grands écrivains français, étude et analyse. Tourcoing, Duvivier. 3 fr.

Brizeux, A., Œuvres. Nouvelle édition. Tome iv. Paris, Garnier. 3 fr.

Caussy, F., Voltaire, seigneur de village. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Chateaubriand, F. R. de, Napoléon. Préface et notes par M. Dreyfous. Nouvelle édition. Paris, Flammarion. 7 fr. 50.

Cochin, H., Lamartine et la Flandre. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 5 fr.

Drouet, J., L'abbé de Saint-Pierre. L'homme et l'œuvre. Paris, Champion. 7 fr. 50.

Faguet, E., Rousseau contre Molière. Paris, Société franc. d'impr. et de libr 3 fr. 50.

Fleischmann, H., Victor Hugo, Waterloo, Napoléon, recueil de documents inédits ou nouveaux publiés ou annotés. Paris, Méricant. 3 fr. 50.

Köwer, C., Stendhal und der Ausdruck der Gemütsbewegungen in seinen Werken. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Beihefte. xxxv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Lardeur, J. B., La vérité psychologique et morale dans les romans de Paul Bourget. Paris, Fontemoing. 2 fr.

Laurentie, F., Sur Barbey d'Aurévilly. Paris, Émile Paul. 3 fr. 50.

Legouis, É., Défense de la poésie française, à l'usage des lecteurs anglais. Paris, Hachette. (London, Constable.) 6 fr.

Lévi-Malvano, Montesquieu et Machiavelli. (Bibl. de l'Institut français de Florence, Tome ii.) Paris, H. Champion. 5 fr.

Mansuy, A., Le monde slave et les classiques français aux xvi—xvii^e^ siècles. Paris, Champion. 10 fr.

Martinon, P., Les Strophes. Étude historique et critique sur les formes de la poésie lyrique en France depuis la Renaissance, avec une bibliographie. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

Maurras, Ch., Trois idées politiques, Chateaubriand, Michelet, Sainte-Beuve. Nouv. édit. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr.

Noel, C. M., Les idées sociales dans le théâtre de A. Dumas fils. Paris, Messein. 5 fr.

Plan, P. P., J. J. Rousseau raconté par les gazettes de son temps. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Rabelais, F., Gargantua. Édition critique publ. par A. Lefranc. Tome i. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

Séché, A., Les accents de la satire dans la poésie contemporaine. Paris, E. Sansot. 3 fr. 50.

Séché, L., Le cénacle de Joseph Delorme (1827–30). Tome i—ii. Paris, Mercure de France. 15 fr.

Stauf von der March, O., Victor Hugo. Eine Würdigung. Pankow-Berlin, Elsner. 2 M.

Strowski, F., Tableau de la littérature française au xix^e^ siècle. Paris, Delaplane. 3 fr. 50.

Vey, E., Le ballet forésien de 1605, suivi d'extraits en prose de la Gazette française en dialecte de Saint-Étienne. Paris, Champion. 4 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

Aasen, I., Skrifter i Samling. Trykt og utrykt. 2.—11. Hefte. Copenhagen. Gyldendal. Each 50 ö.

Bang, H., Værker i Mindeudgave. 1.—8. Hefte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. Each 50 ö.

Castrén, G., Johan Ludvig Runeberg. (Sveriges Nationallitteratur, xxv.) Stockholm, Beijer. 2 kr.

Feuk, M., Lidners poetiska språk. En Stilstudie. Lund, Gleerupska bogh. 2 Kr. 50.

Hesselman, B., Västnordiska studier. I. Om brytningen. Uppsala, Akad. bokh. 2 Kr.

Ibsen, H., Works. Vol. XII. From Ibsen's Workshop. London, Heinemann. 4*s*.

Dutch, Frisian, Low German.

Dornfeld, E., Untersuchungen zu Gottfried Hagen's Reimchronik der Stadt Köln, nebst Beiträgen zur mittelripuarischen Grammatik. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XL.) Breslau, M. and H. Marcus. 10 M. 80.

Dunkmann, A., Ostfriesisch-plattdeutsches Dichterbuch. Mit einer Einleitung: Geschichte der niederdeutschen Sprache und Literatur in Ostfriesland. Aurich, Dunkmann. 3 M.

Kalff, G., Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde. VII. Groningen, J. B. Wolter. 6 fl. 50.

Müller, J. C., Memoriale linguae frisicae. Nach der Jeverschen Orig.-Handschrift herausg. von E. König. (Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung, IV. Band.) Norden, D. Soltau. 6 M. 40.

English.

(*a*) *General* (Language).

Jespersen, O., Growth and Structure of the English Language. 2nd ed. Leipzig, Teubner. 1.

Smith, L. P., The English Language. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s*. net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Bramis, J., Historia regis Waldei. Herausg. von R. Imelmann. (Bonner Studien zur engl. Philologie, IV.) Bonn, P. Hanstein. 10 M.

Chadwick, H. M., The Heroic Age. Cambridge, University Press. 12*s*. net.

Chambers, R. W., Widsith. A Study in Old English Heroic Legend. Cambridge, University Press. 10*s*. net.

Gabrielson, A., The Influence of *W-* in Old English as seen in the Middle English Dialects. Göteborg, Eranos' Förlag.

Grein, C. W. M., Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter. Unter Mitwirkung von F. Holthausen neu herausg. von J. J. Köhler. 1.—2. Lieferung. (Germanistische Bibliothek. IV. Reihe. Wörterbücher. IV, 1, 2.) Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M. 50.

Grein, C. W. M., Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa. VIII. Band, I. Teil. Das Epinaler und Erfurter Glossar. Neu herausg. von O. B. Schlutter. I. Faksimile und Transliteration des Epinaler Glossars. Hamburg, H. Grand. 8 M.

Ker, W. P., English Literature: Mediaeval. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s*. net.

Kolbe, T., Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur altenglischen Grammatik. (Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie, V.) Bonn, P. Hanstein. 5 M.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Becker, F., Bryan Waller Procter (Barry Cornwall). (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXVII.) Vienna, Braumüller. 4 M. 50.

Bradsher, E. L., Mathew Carey, Editor, Author and Publisher. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 5*s*. 6*d*. net.

Brown, M. J., Historical Ballad Poetry of Ireland. Dublin, Educational Co. of Ireland. 3*s*. 6*d*.

Browning, R., Works. With Introductions by F. G. Kenyon. (Centenary Edition.) Vol. I. London, Smith Elder. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Browning, R., The Centenary Celebration at Westminster Abbey, May 7, 1912. Edited by Prof. Knight. London, Smith Elder. 2*s.* net.

Byroniana und anderes aus dem englischen Seminar in Erlangen. Erlangen, M. Mencke. 1 M. 60.

Cambridge History of English Literature, The. Vol. VIII. The Age of Dryden. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 9*s.* net.

Collins, J. C., Posthumous Essays. Edited by L. C. Collins. London, Dent. 6*s.* net.

Cowl, R. P., An Anthology of Imaginative Prose. London, Herbert and Daniel. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Daffis, H., Hamlet auf der deutschen Bühne bis zur Gegenwart. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, L.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M.

Donady, J., La mer et les poètes anglais. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Fyfe, T. A., Who's who in Dickens : a complete Dickens repertory in Dickens' own words. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 6*s.* net.

Henderson, T. F., The Ballad in Literature. (Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

Jonson, B., Cynthia's Revels, ed. with Introduction, Notes and Glossary by A. C. Judson. (Yale Studies in English, XLV.) New York, H. Holt & Co.

Köhler, B., Die Schilderung des Milieus in Shakespeares Hamlet, Macbeth und King Lear. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, XLVI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 40.

Koeppel, E., Robert Browning. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLVIII.) Berlin, E. Felber. 5 M.

Langdon, I., Materials for a Study of Spenser's Theory of Fine Art. Ithaca, New York.

Lawrence, W. J., The Elizabethan Playhouse and other Studies. London, A. H. Bullen. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Leschtsch, A., Der Humor Falstaffs. (Neue Shakespeare-Bühne, X.) Berlin, H. Paetel. 3 M.

Lohr, P., Le printemps d'Yver und die Quelle zu Fair Em. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLIX.) Berlin, E. Felber. 1 M. 50.

Makower, S. V. and Blackwell, B. H., A Book of English Essays, 1600–1900. (World's Classics.) London, H. Frowde. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Menaechmi, The : the original of Shakespeare's Comedy of Errors. The Latin text together with the Elizabethan translation, ed. by W. H. D. Rouse. London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mosher, J. A., The Exemplum in the Early Religious and Didactic Literature of England. (Columbia University Studies in English.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Notestein, W., A History of Witchcraft in England, 1558–1718. Washington, American Historical Association. 1 dol. 50.

Owen, D. L., Piers Plowman : a Comparison with some earlier and contemporary French Allegories. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 5*s.* net.

Prinz, J., A Tale of a Prioress and her three Wooers. Text mit Einleitung. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLVII.) Berlin, E. Felber. 5 M.

Rich, B., Apolonius and Silla : an original of Shakespeare's 'Twelfth Night.' Edited by M. Luce. London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Roz, F., Le Roman anglais contemporain. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Shelley, P. B., Prose Works. Reprinted from the original editions and edited by R. H. Shepherd. 2 vols. London, Chatto and Windus. 4*s.* net.

Swift, J., Correspondence. Edited by F. E. Ball. Vol. III. London, G. Bell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wolff, S. F., The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. (Columbia University Studies in Comparative Literature.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Woodberry, G. E., Swinburne. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General.*

Boehme, G., Neudeutsche Grammatik oder Reformdeutsch. Ein Versuch, die deutsche Sprache zu vereinfachen und zugleich weiter auszubauen. Tübingen, A. und S. Weil. 4 M. 50.

Collitz, H., Das schwache Präteritum und seine Vorgeschichte. (Hesperia, I.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 8 M.

Müller-Fraureuth, K., Wörterbuch der obersächsischen und erzgebirgischen Mundarten. 5. Lieferung. Dresden, W. Baensch. 3 M. 50.

Riesenfeld, P., Heinrich von Ofterdingen in der deutschen Literatur. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 7 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Kraus, C. von, Mittelhochdeutsches Übungsbuch. (Sammlung germanischer Elementar- und Handbücher. III. Reihe. Lesebücher, II.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M. 60.

Michiels, H., Über englische Bestandteile altdeutscher Glossenhandschriften. Bonn, Hanstein. 3 M.

Vignola, B., Il poema dei Nibelungi : appunti di critica e di estetica. Verona, R. Cabianca. 2 L. 50.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Bartscherer, A., Zur Kenntnis des jungen Goethe. Drei Abhandlungen. Dortmund, F. W. Ruhfus. 4 M. 50.

Blanc, M., Étude littéraire sur les élégies romaines de Goethe. Paris, Berger-Levraut. 3 fr. 50.

Bleibtreu, C., Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur von Goethes Tod bis zur Gegenwart, herausg. von G. Gellert. Berlin, W. Herlet. 3 M.

Börne, L., Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe in 12 Bänden. Herausg. von L. Geiger. Vols. I—III. Berlin, Bong und Co. Each 2 M.

Bötcher, E., Goethes Singspiele 'Erwin und Elmire' und 'Claudine von Villa Bella' und die 'opera buffa.' Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 3 M.

Breitner, A., Joseph Viktor von Scheffel und seine Literatur. Bayreuth, B. Seligsberg. 12 M.

Eiermann, W., Gellerts Briefstil. (Teutonia, XXIII.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 3 M. 50.

Fries, A., Stilistische Beobachtungen zu Wilhelm Meister, mit Proben angewandter Ästhetik. (Berliner Beiträge zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie, XLIV.) Berlin, E. Ebering. 2 M. 80.

Germany in the Nineteenth Century. Five Lectures by various authors. Manchester, Sherratt and Hughes. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Goethe, J. W. von, Ausgewählte Gespräche. Volksausgabe. Herausg. von F. von Biedermann. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 2 M. 50.

Goethe, J. W. von, Werke. Herausg. im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen. IV. Abt., 50. Band. Nachträge und Undatiertes. Weimar, Böhlau. 8 M. 80.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Werke. Grossherzog Wilhelm Ernst-Ausgabe. X (Kunstschriften, II) und XI (Übersetzungen). Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 6 M. and 6 M. 50.

GRILLPARZER, F., Werke. Herausg. von A. Sauer. II. Abt., 1. Band. (Jugendwerke, I.) Vienna, Gerlach und Wiedling. 7 M. 20.

HAGEN, E. VON DEM, Goethe als Herausgeber von 'Kunst und Alterthum' und seine Mitarbeiter. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 50.

HAMMES, F., Das Zwischenspiel im deutschen Drama von seinen Anfängen bis auf Gottsched. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLV.) Berlin, E. Felber. 5 M.

HARGRAVE, M., Some German Women and their Salons. London, Laurie. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

HAERTEL, W., Johann von Besser. Sein Leben und seine Werke. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLVI.) Berlin, E. Felber. 4 M.

HENZE, H., Die Allegorie bei Hans Sachs. (Hermaea, XI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

KETTNER, G., Goethes Drama 'Die natürliche Tochter.' Berlin, Weidmann. 3 M. 40.

KLEIST, H. VON, Gespräche. Nachrichten und Überlieferungen aus seinem Umgange. Herausg. von F. von Biedermann. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 2 M. 50.

KOFINK, H., Lessings Anschauungen über die Unsterblichkeit und Seelenwanderung. Strassburg, Trübner. 6 M.

KREBS, W., Friedrich von Matthisson (1761–1831). Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 60.

KÜHLHORN, W., J. A. Leisewitzens Julius von Tarent. Erläuterung und literarhistorische Würdigung. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, X.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 80.

LESSING, O. E., Masters in Modern German Literature. Dresden, Reissner. 4 M.

MCCABE, J., Goethe, the Man and his Character. London, Nash. 15*s.* net.

MANGOLD, H. W., Studien zu den ältesten Bühnenverdeutschungen des Terenz. (Hermaea, X.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M. 40.

PENNY, A. J., Studies in Jacob Böhme. London, Watkins. 6*s.* net.

REINECKE, C., Studien zu Halms Erzählungen und ihrer Technik. (Sprache und Dichtung, IX.) Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr. 2 M. 50.

ROBERTSON, J. G., Goethe and the Twentieth Century. (Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

SCHARRER-SANTEN, E., A. Wilbrandt als Dramatiker. Munich, H. Sachs-Verlag. 3 M. 50.

SCHOLTE, J. H., Probleme der Grimmelshausenforschung. I. Groningen, J. B. Wolter. 2 fl. 40.

SIUTS, H., Jenseitsmotive im deutschen Volksmärchen. (Teutonia, XIX.) Leipzig, E. Avenarius. 8 M.

STIFTER, A., Sämtliche Werke. IV. Bd. 1. und 2. Teil. Herausg. von L. Müller und S. Nadler. (Bibl. deutscher Schriftsteller aus Böhmen, XXIII, XXIV.) Prague, J. G. Calve. Each 6 Kr.

TONNELAT, E., Les Contes des frères Grimm. Étude sur la composition et le style du recueil des Kinder- und Hausmärchen. Paris, A. Colin. 10 fr.

TONNELAT, E., Les frères Grimm. Leur œuvre de jeunesse. Paris, A. Colin. 7 fr. 50.

VOIGT, J., Goethe und Ilmenau. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 5 M.

WITTE, E., Falk und Goethe. Rostock, H. Warkentien. 3 M.

WOLFF, J., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von J. Lauff. I. Serie. 1. Band. Leipzig, P. List. 3 M.

WÜSTLING, F., Tiecks William Lovell. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, VII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

433.

VOLUME VII OCTOBER, 1912 NUMBER 4

THE VENETIAN TEXT (*COD. MARC. LAT. XIV*, 115) OF DANTE'S LETTER TO THE EMPEROR HENRY VII.

§ I.

THE Latin text of Dante's letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII) has been preserved in three MSS., two of the fourteenth century (*Cod. Vaticano-Palatino Latino* 1729, in the Vatican; and *Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8, in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome), and one of the fifteenth (*Cod. Marciano Latino* XIV, 115, in the Biblioteca Marciana at Venice). The Vatican and S. Pantaleo texts have been transcribed in two previous articles in this *Review* (Vol. VII, pp. 1—39, 208—24). I now subjoin a transcript of the third, the Venetian MS., thus completing the series, whereby the whole of the MS. evidence for the Latin text of this and eight other letters is now for the first time made accessible to the student of Dante.

This MS., a brief account of which was given in a previous article[1], appears to have been executed at Siena, between 1481 and 1500[2]. The Latin text of Dante's letter to Henry VII was first printed from this MS. by Karl Witte in his *Dantis Alligherii Epistolae quae exstant* (*Epist.* VI, pp. 30—46), privately printed at Padua in 1827. As the collations of the various printed texts of this letter have already been given in the article referred to above[3], it is not proposed to repeat them on the present occasion. An exception, however, is made in the case of Witte's text, which he claims to have printed direct from the Venetian MS.; but the collation will show that, though he professed to register in his *apparatus criticus* his departures from the reading of the MS., in not a few important passages he has introduced emendations *sub silentio*, while in others he has misread the MS. and registered readings which are non-existent.

[1] *M. L. R.* Vol. VII, p. 4, n. 7.
[2] See P. Wagner, *Die Echtheit der drei Kaiserbriefe Dantes im Lichte der Kritik* (Köln, 1906), p. 9.
[3] *Loc. cit.*, pp. 4—12.

As in the former transcripts, the contractions of the MS. have been expanded, the expansions being printed in italics. The punctuation of the MS., such as it is, has been preserved. The folios of the MS. [8ro—11ro] are indicated in the transcript; as are the lines (numbered in round brackets) of each separate folio. For convenience of reference, as before, the text of the letter has been broken up into sections, numbered [in square brackets] to correspond with the numbering of those in the Oxford Dante; and the colophon, which is written continuously with the text in the MS., has been detached and printed as a separate paragraph.

§ II.

In the MS.[1] the title of the letter, consisting of six lines and two words, begins at the top of fol. 8ro. The text of the letter begins at l. 8, and ends in the middle of l. 11 of fol. 11ro, the colophon, which consists of two lines and a half, ending at l. 13, in the middle of the folio, the remainder of which is occupied by another text.

In the *apparatus criticus*, Vat. indicates the Vatican MS.; Pant. the S. Pantaleo MS.; Ven. the Venetian MS.; and W. the *editio princeps* of the text as printed by Witte in the above-mentioned volume in 1827.

Sanctissimo Triumphatori[2] *et* domino (2) singulari D*omi*no Henrico[3] diuina p*r*ouiden-(3)-tia Roma*n*o*rum* rege[4] semp*er*[5] augusto deuotissi-(4)-mi sui Dantes Aldigherrj[6] florentinus (5) *et* exul i*m*meritus ac uniuersaliter o*mn*es (6) Thusci[7] qui pace*m* desiderant terre obsculu*m* (7) an*te* pedes[8].

[§ 1.] (8) Immensa dei dilectione testante relicta nobis est[9] (9) pacis hereditas: ut *in* sua mira dulcedine mili-(10)-tie no*st*re dura[10] mites-cere*n*t *et* in usu eius patrię (11) triumphis[11] gaudia mereremur. At liuor a*n*ti-(12)-qui *et* implacabilis hostis. humane p*r*osperita-(13)-ti semp*er et* co*n*late*n*ter[12] insidians: non nullos (14) exheredando uolentes

[1] I am in possession of a photographic reproduction of the folios of the MS. containing Dante's letter, for the execution of which I am indebted to the kind offices of Mr Horatio F. Brown.

[2] Pant. *Gloriosissimo atque felicissimo T.*; in Vat. the title is wanting.

[3] Pant. *Henricho.*

[4] Pant. W.* *Regi.*

[5] Pant. *et semper.*

[6] *Sic*; Pant. *alagherii*; W.* *Alligherius.*

[7] Pant. W.* *Tusci.*

[8] W.* *osculantur pedes.*

[9] Vat. *est nobis.*

[10] W.* *durae.*

[11] Vat. Pant. W. *triumphantis.*

[12] Vat. *latanter*; Pant. W. *latenter*; W. erroneously gives *colatenter* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio.*

ob tutoris absentiam nos[1] (15) alios impie[2] denudauit[3] inuitos. Hinc diu sem-(16)-per[4] flumina confusionis defleuimus et patroci-(17)-nia iusti regis incessanter[5] implorauimus[6]: et[7] (18) qui satellicium saeui Tyranni disperderet et nos (19) in nostra iusticia reformaret. Cumque tu Cae-(20)-saris et Augusti subcessor Apennini iuga (21) transiliens ueneranda signa turpia[8] retulisti (22) Protinus longa substiterunt suspiria la-(23)-chrymarumque diluuię[9] desierunt et ceu[10] Tytan (24) precipitatus[11] exoriens noua spes latio seculi (25) melioris effulxit. Tunc plerique uota sua (26) preuenientes in iubilo. tam saturnia regna quam (fol. 8ᵛᵒ) uirginem redeuntem cum Marone cantabant.

[§ 2.] (2) Verum quia sol noster. siue desiderij fer-(3)-uor hoc submoueat[12] siue facies ueritatis: (4) aut morari jam[13] Creditur[14] aut retrocedere (5) supputatur[15]. quasi Iosue denuo uel amos (6) filius imperaret: incertitudine[16] dubitare com-(7)-pellimur: et in uocem precursoris irrumpere[17]. (8) Sic tu es qui uenturus es. an alium expecta-(9)-mus. Et quamuis longa sitis in dubium que (10) sunt certa propter esse propinqua ut assolet (11) furibunda deflectat. Nihilominus in te cre-(12)-dimus et speramus: asseuerantes te dei[18] mini-(13)-strum: et ecclesię filium: et romanę glorię (14) promotorem. Nam et ego qui scribo tam (15) pro me quam pro aliis uel[19] decet imperatoriam (16) maiestatem: benignissimum uidi et clemen-(17)-tissimum te audiui. Cum pedes tuos manus (18) mee[20] tractarunt. et labia mea debitum per-(19)-soluerunt: cum[21] exultauit in me spiritus meus. (20) Cum tacitus dixi mecum Ecce agnus dei (21) ecce qui tollit[22] peccata mundi.

[§ 3.] Sed quid tam (22) sera moretur segnities admiramur. quan-(23)-do iam dudum[23] in ualle uictor Heridani[24] non (24) secus[25] tusciam derelinquis[26]: pretermictis. et negli-(25)-gis quam si[27] iura[28] tuendi[29] imperij

[1] Vat. *non.*
[2] Vat. *impios.*
[3] Pant. *denudare.*
[4] Vat. Pant. W. *super.*
[5] Vat. *incensanter.*
[6] Vat. Pant. *implorabamus.*
[7] Vat. Pant. W. omit *et.*
[8] Vat. Pant. W.* *tarpeia.*
[9] Vat. Pant. W.* *diluuia.*
[10] W. *quasi*; he erroneously gives *cum* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[11] Vat. Pant. *preoptatus.*
[12] Vat. *summoueat*; Pant. *summoneat*; W. *submoneat.*
[13] W. inserts *te* before *jam.*
[14] W.* *credunt.*
[15] W.* *supputant.*
[16] Vat. *in certitudine.*
[17] W. *erumpere.*
[18] Vat. omits *dei.*
[19] Vat. Pant. *uelut*; W. *ut.*
[20] Pant. (apparently) *uitas.*
[21] Vat. *tunc.*
[22] Pant. *tollis.*
[23] Pant. omits *dudum.*
[24] Pant. *victor in ualle victor Heridianj.*
[25] W.* omits *non secus.*
[26] W.* *derelinquens.*
[27] W.* *quasi.*
[28] Pant. *vita.*
[29] Vat. Pant. *tutanda.*

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio.*

circum*scribi* Li-(26)-gur*um*[1] finibus arbitreris. Non prorsus ut (fol. 9ro) suspicamur aduertens[2] quoniam Romanor*um* (2) gloriosa[3] pot*es*tas nec mętis italię: nec iriconis[4] (3) Europę margine cohartat*ur*[5]. Nam *et* si uim (4) passa in[6] Augustum[7] gubernacula sua co*n*traxit[8]: (5) undiq*ue* tamen de *in*uiolabili Iure fluctus. Am-(6)-phitricis[9] attingens[10] uix ab inutili unda ocea-(7)-ni se circum*c*ingi dignat*ur* Scriptum est *enim*[11] nasce-(8)-tur. pulchra Troyanus origine Caesar. Impe-(9)-rium[12] occeano famam qui terminet astris. Et (10) Cum vniuersaliter orbem describi edixisset (11) Augustus vt bos noster euangelizans accen-(12)-sus ignis flamma[13] remugit[14]. Si non de Iustissimi (13) principatus aula prodijsset[15] edictum. unige-(14)-nitus dei filius homo factus qui[16] ad proficen-(15)-dum[17] secundum naturam assumptam edicit[18] se (16) subditum. Nequaq*uam* tunc[19] nasci de uirgine uo-(17)-luisset. Non *enim* suasisset iniustum[20] qui[21] om-(18)-nem iusticiam implere debebat[22].

[§ 4.] Pudeat itaq*ue* (19) *in* angusta[23] mundi area metiri[24] tam diu quem (20) mundus omnis expectat *et* ab augusta[25] circum-(21)-spectione non defluat q*uod* tuscana[26] Tyrannis in (22) dilationis fiducia confortatur. ut[27] cotidie ma-(23)-lignantium cohartando[28] superbiam uires nouas (24) accumulat temeritatem temeritati adiciens. In-(25)-tonet igitur[29] uos[30] illa Curionis In Caesarem. Dum (26) trepidant nullo firmari[31] robore partes. Tolle (fol. 9vo) moras nocuit semper[32] differre paratis. Par la-(2)-bor atq*ue* mętas[33] precio maiore petuntur. Into-(3)-net illa uox increpitantis Annubis[34] in[35] Eneam. (4) Si te nulla mouet tantarum

[1] Pant. (apparently) *ligineranj*; W.* *Liguriae.*
[2] Pant. *aduerteris.*
[3] W.* omits *gloriosa.*
[4] Vat. Pant. W.* *tricornis.*
[5] W. reads *coartatur*, and erroneously gives *cohartant* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[6] Vat. *non.*
[7] W. *angustum.*
[8] Vat. Pant. *contraxerit.*
[9] Vat. *amphitritis*; Pant. *amphytretis*; W.* *Amphitrites.*
[10] Vat. *attigens.*
[11] Vat. *scriptum etenim uobis est*; Pant. *Scriptum et enim nobis est.*
[12] Pant. *Imperij.*
[13] Vat. Pant. *ignis eterni flamma.*
[14] Pant. *remigit.*
[15] Pant. *prodisset.*
[16] Vat. Pant. W. omit *qui.*
[17] Vat. Pant. W. *profitendum.*
[18] Vat. Pant. W. *edicto.*
[19] W.* *tum.*
[20] Pant. *in iustum.*
[21] Vat. Pant. *quem.*
[22] Vat. Pant. *decebat.*
[23] Vat. Pant. *angustissima.*
[24] Vat. Pant. W. *irretiri.*
[25] Vat. Pant. *augusti.*
[26] Pant. *Tuschana.*
[27] Vat. Pant. W. *et.*
[28] Vat. W.* *cohortando*; Pant. *coartando.*
[29] Vat. Pant. *iterum.*
[30] Vat. Pant. W.* *vox.*
[31] Vat. *firmate*; Pant. (apparently) *firmmte*; W.* *firmatae.*
[32] Vat. Pant. W.* *semper nocuit.*
[33] Vat. Pant. W.* *metus.*
[34] Vat. *a nubis*; Pant. W.* *a nubibus.*
[35] Vat. Pant. *iterum in.*

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio.*

gloria rer*um*. Nec (5) sup*er* ipse tua moliris[1] laude labore*m* Ascaniu*m* (6) surgente*m* et spes heredis Iuli[2] respice cui Re-(7)-gnum[3] italię Romanaq*ue* regna[4] debentur[5].

[§ 5.] Io-(8)-hannes namq*ue* regius primogenitus tuus *et* (9) Rex: quem post diei orientis occasum mu*n*-(10)-di subcessiua prosperitas[6] prestoletur[7] Nobis (11) est alter. Ascanius[8] qui uestigia[9] magni geni-(12)-toris obseruans in Turnos ubiq*ue* sicut Leo de-(13)-seuiet *et* in latino[10] uelut agnus[11] mitescet (14) precaueant sacratissimi Regis alta consi-(15)-lia: ne coeleste iudiciu*m* Samuelis illa uerba (16) reasper*e*t: Nonne cu*m* paruulus esses[12] i*n*[13] oculis (17) tuis caput *in* tribus[14] Ysrael factus es. unxit-(18)-q*ue* deus[15] in rege*m*[16]: *et* misit te deus[17] in uia*m*[18]: et ait (19) uade et interfice peccatores Amalech. Nam (20) et tu in rege*m* sacratus es. ut Amalech p*er*cutias[19]: (21) *et*[20] Agagi[21] parcas minime[22]: atq*ue* ulciscaris illum (22) q*ui* misit te de gente i*n* gente*m* brath bratali[23]: *et* (23) de festina sua solemnitate que quidem *et* Ame-(24)-lech et Agagi[24] sonare dicuntur[25].

[§ 6.] tu Mediolani (25) tam uernando q*uam* hyemando moraris *et* Hydra*m*[26] (26) pestifera*m* p*er* Capitu*m* amputatione*m* reris[27] extinguere (fol. 10ro) q*uod* si[28] magnalia gloriose[29] alcidę[30] recensuisses. te (2) ut illum falli cognosceris[31] cui pestilens a*nim*al (3) capite repupulare[32] multiplici p*er* damnu*m* cresce-(4)-bat donec instanter[33] magnanimis[34] uitę principiu*m* (5) Impetiuit[35]. Non enim[36] ad arbores extirpandas[37]

[1] Vat. *molitis.*
[2] Pant. *Iulij.*
[3] Vat. *regimen.*
[4] Pant. *tellus.*
[5] Pant. adds *etcetera.*
[6] Vat. Pant. W.* *posteritas*; in MS. *prosteritas* has been altered from *prosperitas.*
[7] Vat. Pant. W.* *prestolatur.*
[8] Pant. *aschanus.*
[9] Pant. *vestigiam.*
[10] Vat. Pant. W.* *Latinos.*
[11] Vat. *agnos.*
[12] Vat. *esset.*
[13] W.* omits *in.*
[14] Vat. Pant. W.* *tribubus.*
[15] Vat. Pant. *unxit que te dominus*; W.* *unxitque Dominus.*
[16] Vat. *in Regem super israel.*
[17] Pant. *dominus.*
[18] Vat. W.* *in via.*
[19] Vat. *percuciens.*
[20] Vat. *ut*; Pant. omits.
[21] Vat. Pant. *Agag.*
[22] Vat. Pant. *non parcas.*
[23] Vat. Pant. W.* *de gente brutali.*
[24] Vat. Pant. *Agag.*
[25] W. omits *que quidem et A. et A. sonare dicuntur*, and erroneously gives *sanare* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[26] Vat. Pant. *ydram.*
[27] Pant. *veris.*
[28] Vat. *quia si.*
[29] Vat. *gloriosi*; W.* *gloriosa.*
[30] W.* *Alcides.*
[31] Vat. Pant. W.* *cognosceres.*
[32] Vat. Pant. *repullulante*; W. *repullulans.*
[33] W.* omits *instanter.*
[34] Vat. Pant. W.* *magnanimus*; the form *magnanimis*, however, was current in the Middle Ages; it is registered by Giovanni da Genova in the *Catholicon*: "*Magnanimus, ma, mum, ...*et *hic* et *hec magnanimis* et *hoc me* in eodem sensu, idest audax, fortis."
[35] W. *amputavit*; he erroneously gives *impertivit* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[36] Vat. Pant. *non etenim.*
[37] Pant. *extirpendas.*

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio.*

(6) ualet ipsa Romanorum[1] incisio. quin[2] iterum mul-(7)-tiplicius uia terre[3] ramescent[4]: quousque radi-(8)-ces incolumes fuerint ut prebeant alimentum (9) qui prees[5] unice mundi[6] peregisse[7] preconiis[8]. Cum cer-(10)-uicem Cremonę deflexeris contumacis. Non-(11)-ne ut tuo[9] vel tu[10] brixię uel papię rabies ino-(12)-pina turgescet. Ymo que cum *etiam*[11] flagellum[12] rese-(13)-derit: Mox alia uerzellis: uel pergami uel (14) alibi returgebit[13] donec huiusmodi rabies tollatur[14] (15) radice[15] tanti erroris auulsa. Cum trunco rami (16) pugitiui[16] arescant.

[§ 7.] An ignoras excellentis-(17)-sime[17] principium[18]: nec de speculo[19] summę celsitudinis (18) deprehendis vbi vulpecula foetoris istius ve-(19)-nantium secura recumbat[20] Quippe nec pado (20) precipiti nec Tyberi tuo criminosa potant[21] ve-(21)-rum Sarni fluenta torrentis adhuc rictus eius[22] (22) Inficiunt *et* Florentiam[23] forte nescis dyra (23) hec pernities nuncupatur. Hec est vipera uersa in (24) uiscera genitricis. Hec languida[24] pecus. que[25] (25) gregem domini sui sua contagione commaculat[26] (26) Hec Myrrha scoelestis *et* impia in Cinere posita[27] (fol. 10vo) amplexus exestuans. Hec amata illa impa-(2)-tiens que repulso fatali connubio: quem semper[28] ne-(3)-gabant generum[29] sibi ascire non timuit sed furia-(4)-liter in bella[30] uocauit[31] *et* demum male ausa (5) dum[32] contra Romam cornua rebellionis exa-(6)-cuit que ad

[1] Vat. Pant. W.* *ramorum.*
[2] W.* *quia.*
[3] Vat. *uirulenter*; Pant. *virulente.*
[4] Vat. Pant. *ramificent.*
[5] Vat. Pant. *quid preses.*
[6] W. *mundo.*
[7] W. *quid peregisse.*
[8] Vat. *preconicis*; Pant. *preconijcis*; W. *praeconiaberis.*
[9] Vat. Pant. W. *nonne tunc.*
[10] Vat. Pant. W. omit *tu.*
[11] W. omits *etiam*, and erroneously gives *et* as the reading of Ven.
[12] Vat. Pant. *flagellata.*
[13] MS. *retũrgebit.*
[14] Vat. Pant. *donec huiusmodi* (Vat. *huius*) *scatescentie causa radicalis tollatur.*
[15] Vat. W. *et radice*; Pant. *et radix.*
[16] Vat. Pant. *pungitiuj*; W. *pungentes*; he erroneously gives *pugitiens* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[17] Vat. *excellentissiue.*
[18] Vat. Pant. W.* *principum.*
[19] Vat. Pant. W.* *specula.*
[20] Vat. *decumbat.*
[21] Vat. Pant. *potatur*; W.* *potat.*
[22] Pant. *ritus eius*; W. *vitia sua*; he erroneously gives *victus es* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[23] Vat. Pant. W. *Floreutia.*
[24] Vat. *hec est languida.*
[25] Vat. omits *que.*
[26] Vat. *commaculans.*
[27] Vat. *in Cinare patris*; Pant. *in amore patris*; W. *in Cinyrae patris*; he erroneously gives *Ciner* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[28] Vat. Pant. *quem fata*; W. *quem sortes*; he erroneously gives *quae semper* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[29] W. erroneously gives *generem* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[30] Vat. *in bella furialiter*; W. *furialiter in bellum*; he erroneously gives *bello* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[31] Vat. *prouocauit.*
[32] Vat. Pant. *male ausa luendo laqueo se suspendit. vere matrem uiperea feritate*

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio.*

ymagine*m* suam atq*ue* similitudine*m* (7) fecit illam. Uere fumo euaporantes[1] sanie ui-(8)-tiantes exalat *et* inde uicinię[2] pecudes *et* ui-(9)-scie[3] *con*tabescunt dum falsis alicie*n*do[4] bla*n*ditiis (10) et figmentis aggregat sibi finitimos *et* insi-(11)-nuat[5] agregatos. uere in paternos ipsa co*n*cu-(12)-bitus[6] dum improba procacitate[7] conatur sum-(13)-mu*m* pontificem[8] q*ui* pater est patru*m* aduersu*m*[9] (14) te uiolare assensum[10] uere dei ordinationi[11] (15) restitit[12] proprię uoluntati[13] ydolum ue*re*na*n*do[14] (16) dum regem[15] aspernata legiptimu*m*[16] non erube-(17)-scit insana regi no*n* suo iura non sua pro (18) male agende[17] potestate pacisci. Sed accen-(19)-dit[18] ad laqueum mulier furiata quo se in-(20)-nectit. Nam sępe q*uis* in reprobum sensu*m* (21) traditur vt traditus faciat ea que *etiam*[19] (22) co*n*ueniunt[20]: que[21] quamuis iniusta[22] sint (23) op*er*a iusta tamen suplicia esse noscuntur (24).

[§ 8.] Eią itaq*ue* rumpe moras proles alta[23] ysai (25) sume tibi fiducia*m* de oculis domini dei sa-(26)-baoth: coram quo agis: *et* Goliam hunc in (fol. 11ro) funda sapientię sue[24]: atq*ue*[25] in lapide[26] uiriu*m* (2) tuaru*m* prosterne: quoniam in eius occasu (3) nos[27] *et* umbra timoris castra phylistino-(4)-rum[28] ope*r*iet. fugient philistei[29] *et* liberabit*ur* (5) Israel tunc hereditas nostra quam sine i*n*ter-(6)-missione deflemus ablatam nobis erit in (7) i*n*tegru*m* restituta. At quidem admodu*m*[30] (8) sacrosancte Yerusalem memores exules (9) *in* babilone gemescimus. Ita tu*n*c

dilaniare contendit dum; W. *male ausa*, [*debitumque solvens, laqueo se suspendit.—Vere viperina feritate matrem lacerare ausa*] *dum*. I erroneously in my first article (*M. L. R.* VII, 10 n. 4) spoke of a 'hiatus' in the MS. here between *ausa* and *dum contra*. There is no hiatus, in the sense of a gap, in the writing, which is continuous, but ten words (apparently representing two lines) have been omitted by the carelessness of the scribe.

[1] Vat. Pant. W. *fumos evaporante*.
[2] Vat. Pant. *uicine*.
[3] *Sic*; Vat. Pant. *inscie*; W. *exterae*.
[4] Vat. Pant. *illiciendo*.
[5] Vat. *infatuat*; Pant. *infatuant*; W. *insanescit*.
[6] Vat. Pant. *in paternos ardet ipsa concubitus*; W. *in p. incensa c.*
[7] Pant. *pro capacitate*.
[8] Vat. Pant. W. *summi pontificis*.
[9] W.* *adversus*.
[10] Vat. *ascensum*.
[11] Corrected from *ordinationis*.
[12] Vat. Pant. W. *resistit*.
[13] Vat. Pant. W. *voluntatis*.
[14] *Sic*, for *uenerando*.
[15] Pant. *regem suum*.
[16] Vat. *ligitimum*.
[17] Vat. *agendu*; Pant. W.* *agendi*.
[18] Vat. Pant. *atendat*; W. *attendit*.
[19] Vat. Pant. W.* *non*.
[20] W. erroneously gives *convenienti* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[21] W.* omits *que*.
[22] Vat. *iusta*; Pant. *in iusta*.
[23] Vat. Pant. *altera*.
[24] Vat. Pant. *tue*; W. *tuae*.
[25] Pant. *at*.
[26] Pant. *lapidem*.
[27] Vat. W. *nox*; Pant. *vox*; in his *apparatus criticus* W. erroneously gives *mos* as the reading of Ven.
[28] Vat. Pant. *filistinorum*; W.* *Philisteorum*.
[29] Vat. *filistej*; Pant. *filistey*.
[30] Vat. *At quem admodum*; Pant. *At quemadmodum*; W. *At quidem, ad modum quo nunc*.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio*.

ciues et re-(10)-spirantes in pace[1] confusionis miserius[2] in gau-(11)-dio reuelemur[3].

Scriptum in Tuscia sub fon-(12)-te[4] sarni xv^{o}[5] Kalendas Maias. diui Henrici fa-(13)-ustissimi[6] cursus ad Italiam anno primo[7].

I propose at a future date to print, either in this *Review* or elsewhere, a critical text, based on my collations of the MSS. and printed editions, of the nine letters attributed to Dante (viz. *Epistolae* I, II, III, V, VI, VII, and the three so-called Battifolle letters) contained in the Vatican, S. Pantaleo, and Venetian MSS., which have formed the subject of this and the two previous articles.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

[1] W. erroneously gives *pacem* in his *apparatus criticus* as the reading of Ven.
[2] Vat. Pant. W.* *miserias.*
[3] Vat. Pant. *recolemus*; W. *revolvemus.*
[4] W.* *fontem.*
[5] Pant. *XV^{a}*; W.* *XI.*
[6] Pant. *diuj faustissimj Herricj.*
[7] Vat. omits the colophon.

* The asterisk denotes that Witte's departure from the reading of the MS. is made *sub silentio.*

LES NOMS ROMANS DE L'« OBLATA MELANURUS,' CUV.

L'*oblata melanurus* Cuv. est un poisson qui abonde dans la Méditerranée. Ses marques caractéristiques sont : de gros yeux noirs, une grosse tache noirâtre des deux côtés de la queue, des stries noires sur le dos, enfin la couleur argentée des côtés et du ventre. De là la plupart de ses noms populaires.

Pour ses grands yeux noirs on lui a donné le nom d'*oculata* (Celsius, Pline), d'où le sarde *ojada* (Carus, *Prodr.*, II, 636 écrit *occhiata*, forme italienne normale), gênois *éuggiâ* (Casaccia), napol. *occhiata*, à Catane *ucchiata*, à Venise *ochià*, *ochiada* ; on peut aussi comparer les noms italiens *occhiata*, *occhione*, *occhialone* par lesquels Paoletti traduit le vénitien *ochià* ; *occhi nera* à Naples (Carus, *op. cit.*) ; enfin, dans Rondelet, *De Pisc. Marin.* (éd. 1554, p. 126), le *nigr'oil* cité comme de Montpélier (cf. Mistral qui donne *negre-uei*, *negre olh* et *nigrol*), et qui, passant dans les grands dictionnaires français, s'y est fait une place jusque dans Littré (le *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, éd. 1771, donne par exemple, *nigroil*, et aussi *négoeil*, *negre*, comme nom du poisson ; on trouve aussi *nigrois* dans le Raymond de 1832 et *négroeil* dans Cotgrave).

La grosse tache de la queue a valu au poisson ses noms en néo-grec : *μελανούρι* en Grèce, *μελανούριον* dans les Cyclades (Carus, *op. cit.*). Rondelet (*op. cit.*), en lui donnant le nom de *melanurus*, l'a identifié avec le *melanurus* de Pline ; *melanurus* a fini par servir de nom spécifique du poisson dans la nomenclature de Cuvier.

Le nom générique *oblata* est fait sur le français *oblade* qui, en définitive, remonte à *oblado*, donné comme marseillais par Rondelet, *De Piscibus Marinis*, ed. 1554, p. 126. On a supposé qu'il s'agissait d'*oblata* « oublie » (voir Mistral à *oublado*) et il semble qu'il faut tenir compte de cette hypothèse devant l'esp. et catal. *oblada*, le prov. *oublado* et le sarde *orbada*, bien que la raison de cette transférence de sens soit loin d'être claire pour moi. D'autre part, de nombreuses formes usitées

sur les bords de la Méditerranée me font songer à **albulata*, dû aux couleurs argentées des côtés et du ventre, **nebulata* dû au dos strié de noir, de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv.

On remarquera d'abord que ce poisson s'appelle *albero bastardo* à Venise (Paoletti, etc.); or *albero* est une variante d'*alboro*, *arboro*, noms à Venise du *pagellus erythrinus* Cuv. C'est un dérivé d'*albulus* sur lequel j'ai dit quelques mots dans la *Rev. de Philol. Franç.*, XXI, 241 et dans la *Rev. des Langues Romanes*, LI, 384; j'ai surtout fait observer que, pour les dérivés romans, il fallait tenir compte d'**abulus, -a* (avec dissimilation du premier *l*) aussi bien que d'*albulus, -a*. Parmi les noms de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., le prov. *aoublado* cité par Azaïs représente parfaitement **albulata*; comme *aoublado* est pour un plus ancien *aublada*[1], peut-être serait-ce par aphérèse de l'*a*, confondu avec la voyelle de l'article féminin, qu'on aurait *ublada*, attesté dans un règlement de 1433 sur la vente du poisson, tiré des archives de Toulon par M. P. Meyer, *Docum. Linguist. du Midi de la France*, p. 627 note (cf. Marseille *ublado*).

Quoi qu'il en soit de ce dernier point, ce n'est ni *oblata*, ni **albulata*, mais seulement **abulata* qui expliquera, me semble-t-il, la genèse de la série suivante de noms de notre poisson: Marseille *blado*, Var *blado*, Nice *blada*, Messine *biata* (on doit le confondre avec le féminin de l'adj. *biatu*, *beatu*; cf. à Valencia en Espagne *beata* = *oblata melanurus* Cuv. d'après Cisternas cité par Carus, *op. cit.*), Naples *jata* (qui est à *biata* comme *janco* à Naples est à l'it. *bianco*), *ajata* (avec agglutination partielle de l'article féminin).

De **nebulata* le prov. *neblado*[2] = *oblata melanurus* Cuv. (cf. prov. *nieulo* 'oublie'). A côté de *neblada*, il y a eu *niblada* (cf. les formes citées par Mistral à *nive*) qui, par l'aphérèse d'*n*, senti comme faisant partie de l'article indéfini, a donné le niçois *ibluda*. Le pluriel d'*iblada*, graphié *hibladas*, est attesté dans un règlement niçois sur la vente du poisson, de peu postérieur à 1445, et publié dans ses *Documents Linguistiques du Midi de la France* (p. 626) par M. P. Meyer[3].

Après cette série de dérivés d'*oblata*, **albulata* (et **abulata*), **nebulata*, il faut encore noter à Valencia (Espagne) *doblada* (= *? peix*

[1] On trouve *anblado* expliqué par l'*oblade* dans la liste des noms français d'animaux de Nemnich, *Polyglotten-Lexicon* (1793–8).

[2] A Cette *neblada* (Doumet d'après Carus, *op. cit.*).

[3] M. Meyer, dans son glossaire, dit: '*hibladas* "vergadelle, poisson de mer"' (Mistral, *iblado*). L'art. *iblado* de Mistral ne vaut rien mais on y renvoie à *oublado* où se lit le véritable sens d'*iblado*. De même, dans Avril, *Dict. Prov.* (1839–40) *blado* est traduit par *vergadelle*. *Vergadelle* est un nom du *box salpa* Cuv.; cf. ma note 36 dans la *Rev. d. L. rom.*, LI, 405.

d'oblada) et *virador*, ce dernier nom dû sans doute à des habitudes du poisson[1]; enfin à Naples *fiata*[2].

Reste, des noms de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., l'esp. *chopa*. Il y a déjà longtemps, M. Meyer-Lübke a proposé de rattacher *chopa* au lat. *clupea* (*Z. für die österreichischen Gymn.*, 1891, p. 768), et dans son *Romanisches etym. Wörterbuch* (fasc. 2 et 3, publ. 1911) il reste du même avis. Voici l'article:

1998 *clupea* 'Alose' (ein Flussfisch), 2. *clipea*.

1. Astur. *chopia*, span. *chopa*, galiz. *jouba*, vgl. serb.-kroat *kobla*.

2. Venez., veron., trevis. *čepa*; ital. *cheppia* 'Wels.'

Pour 2, je remarque que Venise *chieppa*, *cheppia*, Fiume *ciepa*, Croatie *čepa*, *čipa* sont bien des dérivés de *clupea*; mais ce sont des noms du *clupea alosa* Cuv. (l'alose) qui n'est pas un poisson de rivière mais plutôt un poisson de mer qui remonte les rivières (cf. Carus, *Prodr.*, II, 552 pour les formes citées); ce n'est pas un nom du *silurus glanis* L. (all. *Wels*) qui n'est pas même mentionné dans le *Catalogo dei Pesci d'acqua dolce d'Italia* de Giovanni Canestrini. Pour ce qui est de la rubrique 1, l'astur. *chopia* m'est inconnu; Rato de Argüeller dans son *Vocabulario* (1891) ne donne que *chopa* avec la vague indication 'pez.' Le galic. *jouba*, nom de l'*engraulis encrasicholus* Cuv., ne peut être séparé des autres noms de ce poisson en Espagne, par ex. de l'esp. *anchova*. Reste l'esp. *chopa* auquel on peut ajouter le port. *choupa* que Michaelis dans son *Novo Diccionario* (7e éd., 1905) traduit par l'all. *ringauge, brandbrassen*.

Que l'esp. *chopa* dérive du lat. *clupea*, c'est ce que ne permettent d'admettre ni la phonétique historique ni les sens attestés pour les deux mots. Je fais la remarque que *chopa* est dans les dictionnaires (p. ex. celui de l'Acad. Royale Espagnole) comme nom de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., mais qu'il se dit aussi en espagnol des poissons du genre *cantharus* Cuv., proches parents de ceux du genre *oblata* Cuv. et qui ont entre autres marques caractéristiques, celle, déjà notée chez l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., de gros yeux cerclés d'une espèce d'anneau. Je cite, d'après Carus, *Prodr.*, II, 626 les formes: esp. *chopa, chupa* = *cantharus lineatus* Thompson, esp. *sopa, jopa* = *cantharus orbicularis*

[1] J'ai déjà dit ailleurs que la zoologie reste très anatomique et ne s'occupe guère des habitudes des poissons.

[2] Les oblades se nourrissent d'algues et de limon comme le *stromateus fiatola* L. (cf. mes notes 99, 100, dans la *Rev. d. L. rom.* LIII, 34), ce qui leur donne un mauvais goût et une mauvaise odeur. J'ai expliqué *fiatola*, nom à Rome du *stromateus fiatola* L., par un **flatula*, forme féminine d'un adj. **flatulus* 'puant.' Si le napol. *fiata* doit s'expliquer par *flata* fém. de l'adj. participial *flatus*, il faudra supposer que cet adjectif a eu le sens de 'puant.'

Cuv. L'examen de ces formes porte à croire que *sopa* est la forme première et que *jopa* est une forme qui a subi l'influence de l'arabe; cf. l'esp. *jurel* = *trachurus Linnaei* Malm. qui se rattache au lat. *saurus* (cf. Barcelone *sorell* = *trachurus Linnaei* Malm. et voir ma note 120 dans la *Rev. d. L. romanes*, LIII, 50).

Si *sopa* est la forme première, serait-ce le même mot que l'it. *soppa*, *suppa*, *zuppa*, piem. *supa*, prov. *soupo*, auv. *supo*, fr. *soupe*, catal. esp. galic. port. *sopa*, dont le sens de 'bouillon' est postérieur à celui de 'tranche de pain trempé dans le bouillon' et qui ne doit pas être séparé de l'it. *zuppo*, langued. *chop*, gasc. *chope*, catal. *xop* 'mouillé'? En Espagne, le sens 'chose mouillée' est attestée pour *sopa*; cf. *sopa de arroyo* 'caillou de rivière.' Il n'est pas impossible que l'esp. *chopa* qui se dit du 'petit logement pratiqué sur le haut de la poupe pour le timonnier' vienne du fait que ce logement était particulièrement exposé à être trempé par l'eau de la mer. Déjà, dans son *De Piscibus Marinis* (1554), Rondelet avait appelé l'attention sur l'extrême humidité de la chair de son *cantharus* (= *cantharus lineatus* Thompson): 'cantharus molli est nimium praehumidaque carne' (p. 122); il dit de l'*oblata melanurus* Cuv., son *melanurus*: 'carne est molli'; on peut donc croire qu'on a donné à ces poissons le nom de *sopa*, *jopa*, *chopa* (pour ce dernier cf. le langued. *chop* 'mouillé' cité plus haut) pour des raisons tirées de l'humidité extrême de leur chair. Pour la forme *chupa*, on a vu plus haut que les formes romanes alternent entre *o* et *u*.

Paul Barbier Fils.

Leeds.

THE EARLIEST FRENCH APOCALYPSE AND COMMENTARY.

I.

MM. Delisle and Meyer, in their *L'Apocalypse en français au xiii^e Siècle*[1], have edited a typical version of the earliest French *Apocalypse* and Commentary, and the specimen they have selected is the manuscript Fr. 403, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, distinguished by them as 'MS. Charles V.' M. Meyer mentions as a remarkable fact that the origin of this once popular version has been lost in obscurity[2]; but though the actual source remains undiscovered, we can learn part of its history from a perusal of the work itself. The object of the present paper is to indicate the sources from which the substance of the commentary is derived and to fix the date of its composition. As to the Scriptural text, M. Meyer may be right in attributing it and the commentary to the same pen. The reason he gives is that where the commentary contains a citation from the *Apocalypse* that citation reproduces the text of the translation[3]. But the same result might be produced if the commentator made use of a previously existing translation of the text and, therefore, it may be that the text belongs to an earlier date than the commentary.

A fourteenth century translation of the French *Apocalypse* and Commentary into English was believed, down to the latter part of the last century, to be an original work of Wycliffe's, but, upon comparison, the identity of the translation with the older French work is placed beyond a doubt[4]. This translation is thought to be, with the possible

[1] Published by the Société des anciens textes français and hereafter cited as Delisle and Meyer.

[2] Delisle and Meyer, p. ccxvii.

[3] Delisle and Meyer, p. ccv.

[4] Bale in the sixteenth century (*Scriptorum illustrium...Catalogus*, ch. vi, pp. 451, 453), Forshall and Madden in 1850 (*The Wycliffe Bible*, I, p. 8) and Shirley in 1865 (*Catalogue of the original works of John Wyclif*, p. 36), attributed this English version to Wycliffe. Arnold, in his *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, 1869–1871 (p. iv), proved by internal evidence that the commentary could not be Wycliffe's, and Miss A. C. Paues, in *A fourteenth century English version*, 1904 (p. xxvii), discovered that it was merely a translation from the French version.

exception of the Psalter, the earliest English translation after the Conquest of any of the books of the Bible[1]. Apart from the English translation, the French version is of special interest to us from the number and beauty of the manuscripts known to have been executed in England[2]; and, beyond this, the commentary is illustrative of an important period in the history of the Church.

In M. Meyer's introduction to MS. Charles V he expresses a decided opinion that the French Commentary is derived from a Latin text now unknown to us in its complete form. An Apocalypse with a commentary belonging to the Osuna collection in the National Library of Madrid and the *Bible moralisée* are believed to represent the lost Latin text, but, if so, they reproduce it in an abridged form[3].

Authorities are not agreed as to the date of the original work. M. Samuel Berger fixes upon the latter half of the twelfth century[4]. M. Delisle also suggests the twelfth century but his collaborateur, M. Meyer, thinks that the work belongs to the first half of the thirteenth century and is inclined to attribute it to the influence of the Franciscans and Dominicans and their efforts to re-establish the unity of the faith by an attack on the heretics and the reform of the clergy. On the whole M. Meyer thinks it would not be rash to conjecture that the commentary is the work of a Franciscan[5]. The manuscript edited by MM. Delisle and Meyer is the earliest now known to exist and M. Meyer dates it in the middle of the thirteenth century and thinks that the author was French, perhaps Norman[6]. M. Delisle gives the manuscript an Anglo-Norman origin and dates it at the commencement of the thirteenth century[7]. M. Berger gives the manuscript the same date as M. Delisle and the dialect as pure Norman[8]. Taking these authorities as a basis, we have a period extending from 1150 to 1250 to choose from in fixing the date of the original composition.

The complete work consists of prologue, scriptural text and commentary. The text is broken up into sections and each section is followed by its commentary. The prologue which contains about seven hundred words has an important bearing on the history of the work. In MS.

[1] Miss Paues, *ut supra*, ed. 1902, p. xxiii.
[2] See J. A. Herbert, *Illustrated Manuscripts*, ch. xii.
[3] Delisle and Meyer, pp. ccxiv *et seq.*
[4] *La Bible française au moyen âge*, pp. 81, 82, 88.
[5] Delisle and Meyer, i, ii, ccvi, ccxvii—ccxix. The general opinion seems to be that the Franciscans were established first, but see Gregorovius, *Hist. of Rome in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Hamilton, vol. v, pt. i, p. 110. The Dominicans claimed to be earlier. See Mat. Paris, *Chron. Majora* (Rolls ed.) iv 279.
[6] Delisle and Meyer, p. ccvi (note), p. ccvii.
[7] *Ibid.* p. ii.
[8] *La Bible française au moyen âge*, pp. 78, 79.

Charles V the prologue is wanting, but this is probably accidental[1]. In all the other manuscripts of the same class there is a prologue beginning with the words: 'Seint Pol l'apostre dit ke tuz iceus ke voillent piement vivere en Jhesu Crist sufferunt persecution[2].' M. Berger tells us that this prologue is the work of the celebrated Bishop of Poitiers, Gilbert de la Porée, who died in 1154[3]. Upon this M. Meyer remarks that Berger has given no proof in support of his assertion and that he, M. Meyer, has not succeeded in verifying it[4]. Proof, however, is not wanting that the French version is an adaptation of Bishop Gilbert's prologue which will be found prefixed to the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* of Albertus Magnus[5]. The same prologue is prefixed to the *Expositio in Apocalypsim* of St Thomas Aquinas[6]. It is also prefixed to the *Postillæ* on the Apocalypse of Nicholas de Lyra[7]. In referring to this matter, the *Histoire littéraire de la France*[8] mentions a commentary on the Apocalypse as one of the works of Gilbert de la Porée, of which 'la préface se trouve à la tête des Postilles de Nicolas de Lyra sur ce livre [l'Apocalypse], et le corps de l'ouvrage a été employé dans une compilation de différens interprètes anciens de l'Apocalypse publiée à Paris l'an 1512 en un volume en 8°.'

If a French version of Gilbert de la Porée's prologue has been chosen for an introduction to our Apocalypse, we might expect that his commentary would have an important bearing on the origin of the French commentary, but this result does not seem to follow. A compilation answering to the description of that referred to at the end of the last paragraph is entitled *Sermones super Apocalypsim*, and was published at Paris by Jehan Petit in 1512[9]. It contains a prologue based on that of Gilbert de la Porée with the addition of a full commentary on the prologue itself. The work purports to contain materials for sermons, especially for Advent and Lent, and to be founded on the commentaries of nine distinct authors, of whom one is Gilbertus, 'qui Augustinum quasi in omnibus imitatur.' Apparently this is all that is now known of Gilbert's commentary. The *Expositio in Apocalypsim* attributed to St Augustine of Hippo and constructed by his editors chiefly from the works of Victorinus, Primasius, and Beda, is contained

[1] Delisle and Meyer, pp. cclvii, cclviii.
[2] MM. Delisle and Meyer give the prologue at length from MS. Bibl. Nat. fr. 9574 (*ed. cit.* p. cclviii).
[3] *La Bible française au moyen âge*, p. 88.
[4] Delisle and Meyer, p. cclvii.
[5] *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1899, vol. xxxviii.
[6] *Divi Thomæ Aquinatis in Beati Joannis Apocalypsim Expositio*, Florentiæ, 1549.
[7] Brit. Mus. i. B. 3064.
[8] Tome xii, 473.
[9] Bodleian, Th. 8°. A. 62.

in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*[1], and bears little resemblance to the French Commentary, for the foundations of which we must look elsewhere.

A peculiar feature of Gilbert's prologue is that it comprises, at the end, a short summary of the first eight verses of Chapter I of the Apocalypse (if we may for this purpose adopt the later arrangement of chapter and verse). In the French version this summary is somewhat extended and in all the French manuscripts to which Gilbert's prologue is prefixed the Scriptural text and Commentary begin at verse 9[2]. The last few lines of Gilbert's prologue are here placed side by side with the corresponding portion of the French version:

GILBERT DE LA PORÉE.

Modus tractandi talis est: primo præmittit Prologum et salutationem, ubi reddit auditores benignos et attentos: quo præmisso accedit ad narrationem. Ante narrationem vero ostendit Christum esse ab æterno sine principio et sine fine, inducens ipsum loquentem: *Ego sum Alpha et Omega*, id est, *principium et finis*. Postea accedens ad narrationem, distinguit septem visiones: quibus terminatis iste liber consummatur.

Præmittit autem Prologum, dicens: *Apocalypsis Jesu Christi*, subaudi, hæc est: sicut in aliis, *Visio Isaiæ hæc est*: et *Parabolæ Salomonis hæ sunt*.

Apocalypsis Jesu Christi quam dedit illi Deus palam facere servis suis, &c. (Chap. i, verse 1).

FRENCH VERSION.
(*MS. Bibl. nat. fr.* 9574.)

[See p. 447, note 2 *supra*.]

Sa manere de treiter si est itele: al commencement met un petit prolonge ou il met le nun del livere, la ou il dit: *Apocalipse* e coment la revelacion lui est feite par le aungele. Après benesquit tuz ceus ki le lisent e ki oyent les paroles de ceste prophetie, e salue les set eglises ke sunt en Asye, e demustre ke nostre trés duz seignur Jhesu Crist vendra al jugement, e tuz ceus ki ci se unt pené le verront, e se pleindrunt sur lui tuttes gens terrienes. Après cest demustre ki il est comencement e fin, ki est e fu e est a venir tuit puissant. E après tuit cest fet sa narracium, dunt il fet sun livere, ke est partie en set visiuns, si ke l'em poet chescune par sei severaument entendre, e dit: *Jeo Johan, vostre frère, &c.* (Chap. i, verse 9).

The commentary of the French version, containing about 17,500 words, is made up of two constituent parts, the line which divides them being for the most part clearly marked. The one part consists of passages adapted from the earlier Latin commentaries, the other is the original work of the author and relates to the circumstances of the time at which the commentary was composed. Amongst the earlier commentaries, that of Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt (obiit A.D. 853), though a far more copious work, seems to correspond most nearly with the French version[3], and it may be noted that Gilbert de la Porée's prologue

[1] Vol. xxxv, col. 2417—2452.

[2] This is the point at which the first of the Seven Visions is said to begin. All the earlier commentaries begin at verse 1.

[3] Haymo's Commentary is in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. CXVII, col. 937.

corresponds with Haymo's in some passages, one of which is here quoted—the corresponding passage in the French version being included:

HAYMO.

Deus Pater previdens tribulationes quas passura erat sancta ecclesia postquam ab apostolis fuit fundata, disposuit cum Filio et Spiritu Sancto eas tribulationes et earum præmia revelare. Jacula que prævidentur minus ledunt. Nam levius ledit quicquid prævidimus ante. Ita Dominus Pater Christo secundum humanitatem manifestavit, Christus Joanni revelavit, Joannes ecclesiæ nunciavit. Unde et hic liber *Apocalipsis*, id est *Revelatio*, vocatur.

GILBERT DE LA PORÉE.

Propterea videns Deus Pater tribulationes quas passura erat Ecclesia ab Apostolis fundata supra petram Christum, ut minus timeantur, disposuit una cum Filio et Spiritu Sancto eas revelare. Revelavit autem tota Trinitas Christo secundum humanitatem, Christus vero Joanni per Angelum, Joannes Ecclesiæ. De qua revelatione hunc librum composuit. Unde et liber iste *Apocalypsis* dicitur, id est *revelatio*.

FRENCH VERSION.
(*MS. Bibl. Nat. fr.* 9574.)

[See p. 447, note 2 *supra*.]

E nostre dus pere de ceel, ke veit e seet tutes choses einz ke eles seient, vist e entendi les tribulations ke seinte Eglise fu a suffrir en ceste vie mortele, e les ordena od sun fiz e Seinte Espirit a demustrer, e tutte la Seinte Trinité, Pere e Filz et Seint Espirit, treis persones e un Deu tuit puissant, les demustra a Jhesu Crist, le filz Deu, en sa humanité; e il, par sun angele, a sun serf seint Johan euvangeliste, ke fist cest livere ke est apelez Apocalipse, ceo est a dire revelation.

Haymo's commentary, in turn, is founded upon the elaborate exposition of Ambrosius Ansbertus (circa A.D. 770)[1], on whose prologue, also, Haymo drew largely. One passage of the French Commentary, viz., where the number of the Beast[2] is explained by the words 'DIC LUX,' can be traced back to Victorinus (obiit A.D. 303), the earliest Latin commentator on the Apocalypse[3]. It seems doubtful, however, whether the passage in Victorinus was not a later interpolation[4], but in any case it is of considerable antiquity and it was adopted by Ambrosius and Haymo as well as by the author of the French version. For the present purpose it will be sufficient to compare some of the passages in the commentary of MS. Charles V with Haymo, who, as far as we can

[1] La Bigne, *Maxima Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. XIII, p. 403.
[2] *Rev.* xiii, 18.
[3] Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. v, col. 317.
[4] *Ibid.* v. 339, note.

see, was one at least of the sources to which the author of the French work applied:

Haymo.	MS. Charles V.
(Rev. ch. i, *v.* 12.) Septem candelabra aurea hoc ipsum significant quod septem ecclesiæ, id est universalem Ecclesiam, dum verba eorum lumen scientiæ simul et amoris incendium probent, donis septiformis Spiritus refertam est.	Par les set candelabras que seint Johan vit est signifié seinte Eglise que est enluminée de set graces del Seint Espirit.
(Ch. iv, 3.) Per lapidem jaspidem, qui utique viridem colorem habet, debemus intelligere claritatem divinitatis Dei Filii....Sardinis autem lapis terræ rubræ similitudinem habet, et idcirco per eum humanitas Filii Dei signatur.	Par les colurs de ii pierres sunt signefié les ii natures en Jesu Crist, le deité et la humanité.
(Ch. v, 3.) *Neque in coelo*, id est in angelis; *neque in terra*, id est in hominibus; *neque in inferno*, id est in animabus jam corpore exemptis.	Ceo qu'il dit que nul ne poet fere, *ne en ciel*, ceo est angele; *ne en terre*, ceo est home; *ne desuz terre*, ceo est alme essue del cors.
(Ch. viii, 3.) Iste angelus alius, qui stetit ante altare, intelligitur homo Christus Deus.	Et l'autre aungele que fu en estant devant l'autel signefie le fuilz Deu en humanité.
Possumus et per thuribulum aureum in quo cremantur aromata, intelligere Ecclesiam.	Le censer d'or signefie seinte Glise.
(Ch. x, 10.) Ipsis sanctis prædicatoribus dulcis est sermo Dei in ore ad prædicandum, ad meditandum, ad exponendum; sed dum coguntur ea complere operibus, quæ docent verbis, vertitur illis in amaritudinem.	Ceo que le livre fu duz en sa bouche et amer en sun ventre signefie que la parole Deu est mult pleisant a escuter et a lire et a preescher, mès mult greve sovent de mettre la en eovre.
(Ch. xii, 14.) In duabus alis mulieri datis, duo intelliguntur Testamenta.	Par les ii eles d'egle que sunt donnés a la femme sunt signifiez les ii testamenz.
(Ch. xiii, 8.) Occisus est autem iste Agnus ab origine mundi, non in se, sed in suis membris, sicut in Abel et multis aliis.	Ceo que li agniel est ocis dès le commencement del munde signefie que nostre Seigneur fu tormenté es siens dès le commencement del munde, si come en Abel, le premier ocis.
(Ch. xiv, 20.) Calcati sunt qui erant in lacu, hoc est in æterna morte depressi sunt, non jam ut purgentur.	Ceo qu'il dist dehors la cité signefie que ceo n'est pas peinne porgatoere, einz est perdurable.
(Ch. xv, 2.) Mare itaque baptismum significat....Sed ipsum mare mistum est igni, et per hoc coagulatum est. In igne autem Spiritus Sanctus intelligitur.	La mer clere comme voarre signefie le baptesme ou li peeché sont lavé; la meslée de feu signefie que la grace del Seint Espirit i est donée.
(Ch. xvii, 5.) Per frontem Babylonis, manifestatio designatur operis. Unde Dominus dicit: *A fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos.*	Ceo que le nun de sun secré est escrit en son frunt signefie ceo que nostre Sire dist, en l'euvangile, des ypocrites: *Par lur frunz* [*fruiz*] *les cognoetrez.*

(Ch. xx, 8.) Nam in his duabus gentibus omnis multitudo intelligitur reproborum. Gog quippe interpretatur *tectum*, Magog *de tecto*.	Et ceo signefient les ii nuns des ii poeples, Gog et Magog, kar autant dit Gog comme *covert* et Magog comme *descovert*. Par ces ii poeples qu'il trait premierement sunt signefié tuit li deciple Antecrist.
(Ch. xxi, 12.) Murus Ecclesiæ est Christus.	Li grant mur haut signefie Jhesu Crist.

Many more parallel passages might be cited to show the intimate connection between the French Commentary and that of Haymo[1].

We refer now to the part of the French Commentary which bears on contemporary history.

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the subject of Antichrist came to occupy a prominent position in theological teaching, especially through the writings of Joachim Abbot of Floris, whose *Expositio* on the Apocalypse was written in the last years of the twelfth century. We find that Antichrist is mentioned at least forty-six times in the French Commentary. In about half these instances the interpretation does not correspond with Haymo. The French commentator speaks of Antichrist as already exercising a powerful influence in the world. The following passages are some of those which do not correspond with Haymo:

Par les chevaus appareillez en bataille est signefié l'orguil et la fierté as deciples Antecrist. Par les coronnes ausi comme d'or et la face comme d'ome est signefié duble ypocresie, une en lur doctrine et autre en lur vie. Par lur cheveus comme de femme est signefié qu'il sunt mol et leger a torner en chascune vice. Par lur denz comme de leon est signefié lur cruelté. Par lur haubers comme de fer est signefié lur duresse encontre verité. Par le soun des eles lur grant boban qu'il unt de la surté qu'il unt (ch. ix, 7—10).

Ceo que la beste fist tuz mercher en la main destre ou en lur frunz signefie que tuit, petit et grant, se confermerunt en eovre et en cuntenance a Antecrist, et ore se conferment au mauvés prelaz. Ceo que nul ne pot acheter ne vendre s'il n'eit le merc ou le nun de la beste signefie que nul n'a poer en seinte Glise de rentes doner et receivre, s'il n'ot merc de parenté ou avoerie par servise (ch. xiii, 16, 17).

Ceo que li tierz angele qui suit les autres dist a grant voiz que tuit cil qui aorerunt le beste et se ymage et tuit cil qui recevrunt sun merc en lur frunt ou en lur main beverunt del vin del ire Deu signefie ke cil qui sunt entechez de la fause doctrine Antecrist ou confourment lur vie a ces deciples, que sunt li faus prelat et li faus clerc, il beverunt le truble boevre en enfer pur les delicius mangers et les delicius boevres que il unt ci; e averunt le feu de enfern pur la ardante coveitise ke il unt ci et la pueur de enfer por la luxure ou il se delitent, et ceo durra sanz fin (ch. xiv, 9—11)[2].

[1] Compare the respective commentaries on the following passages: *Rev.* ch. iv, 3, 4—6; v, 1—5, 6—10; vi, 2, 5—6, 7—8, 12—17; viii, 1—2, 5, 6—7, 8—9, 10—11; ix, 1—6, 7—12; x, 1—4; x, 11—xi, 2; xi, 19; xii, 1—6; xiii, 11—14, 16—18; xiv, 1—5, 6—7, 14—16, 17—20; xv, 1—4; xvi, 17—21; xviii, 4—10; xix, 12; xx, 1—3; xxi, 1—8, 9—17, 18—20; xxii, 1—5, 20.

[2] Haymo compares the image of the beast with Antichrist but makes no reference to false prelates and false clerks.

Ceo qu'il funt miracles et assemblent les rois en bataille signefie que, ausi comme diables, par Antecrist et ces deciples, fera resembler miracles enchantemenz, et esmoverunt les princes encontre les crestiens, tut ausi avient il ore en S. Glise que li diables, par faus prelaz et faus clers, fet miracles et merveilles, si comme de un enfant qui ne set mie garder une pome fet il gardein de almes a millers[1], et corrumpent les princes par mauvese essample (ch. xvi, 14).

Ceo que li angele moustra a saint Johan la dampnatiun de la grant bordelere signefie que Nostre Sire fet entendre au bon prelat que la dampnatiun Antecrist et de ces deciples sera por ydolatrie et avarice et luxure, kar par la bordelerie que siet sur meintes eves est signefié Antecrist qui regnera sure mainz poeples, et li faus prelat qui coveitent les grans richeces, que sunt signefié par les eves, et veolent estre hònuré et cremuz en terre plus que a eus ne apent. Ceo que li prince de terre unt fet lur fornicatiun ove la bordelere signifie que li lai prennent esample de Antecrist et de faus religius et des aesez clers de vivere en delices (ch. xvii, 1, 2).

La femme qui seeit sur la best rouge signefie Antecrist et les siens qui meinent deliciose vie en ce munde[2]....Ceo qu'ele estoit vestue de purpre et aornée de or signefie qu'il resemblent a la sote gent du munde, sages pur les honurs et les richeces qu'il unt (ch. xvii, 3, 4).

Par les x rois qui serunt suggez a Antecrist sunt signefiez li haut home du monde qui guerraent par eovre les x commandemenz Deu[3]. Touz unt un conseill; ceo est le conseil du munde, por conquerre a droit et a tort de lur suggez et de lur promes[4]. Lur poer et lur vertu livrerent a la beste, kar tut lur aage et lur sen despendent il ou servise au deable. Et, si come les rois desuz Antecrist se combatirent ove le agniel et a ses membres, por eus tolir la foi Jhesu Crist, tout ausint cil qui ore sunt guerraent S. Eglise, ne mie soulement en temporens chose, mès espiriteument, kar par les taillages et les toutes ke il funt destreingnent il la menue gent a pecher; mès li agnel veintra au jugement, kar tuit li jugement sunt donné au fiulz Deu, et li juge sunt leal. Ceo qu'il dit que les eves sur que la femme seeit sunt plusurs genz signefie que le plus du munde suivra Antecrist quant il vendra, et ore sunt en charnel delit (ch. xvii, 12—15).

'The heretics' are one of the special objects of attack by the author of the French Commentary:

Par Jezabel sunt signefié li maistre herite ki vivent solunc la volenté de la char, et ensement enseignent encuntre l'euvangile. Ceus ne deivent pas Crestiens suffrir entre eus, puis qu'il sunt endurci en lur folie, si come dit li apostre (ch. ii, 20).

Par le cheval neir sunt signefié li herite en ki deable regne. Par la balance est signifié discretiun, qu'il dient qu'il unt en escripture, mès la predicatiun del euvangile les defent qu'il ne damagent ceus que Nostre Sire a rachaté de sun sanc (ch. vi, 5, 6).

Par l'esteille que chei del ciel en terre est signefié le diable qui oevre le puiz de abyme; ceo est la subtile heresie que est en queors au deciples Antecrist. La

[1] This refers to the practice of presenting young children, even females, or idiots, to benefices, that the profits might be retained in the family. Pope Innocent III complains of these transactions in a letter to the Abbess of Remirement in Lorraine in 1202. He says that clerks who hold benefices of her substitute for themselves their sons or their nephews, as by right of succession, and thus render the sanctuary of God hereditary. It thus happens, he continues, that infants of five years, or even idiots, obtain cures. If the clerk has no son or nephew, but a niece, he gives it to her as a dot (Luchaire, *Innocent III, Le Concile de Latran, etc.* 104; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. ccxiv, col. 1035). Lea (*Hist. of the Inquisition*, i, p. 16) says, quoting St Bernard: 'Boys were inducted into the episcopate at an age when they rejoiced rather at escaping from the ferule of their teachers than at acquiring rule.'

[2] Other MSS. have 'ceste siècle' for 'ce munde.'

[3] See also the Commentary on ch. xii 3, where the ten horns of the dragon are likened to 'les richesces del munde dunt li prince guerraent les x commandemenz Deu.'

[4] See also the Commentary on ch. xxi, 8: 'Par les homecides sunt signifié ceus qui lur prume ocient corporeument ou espiritelment.'

fumée que en surt et enoccurcist le soleil signefie la fause doctrine que fera enoscurcir la fei en plusurs (ch. ix, 1, 2).

Li chevalier signefient li tyrant del munde ; les chevaus les herites qui funt les autres mesfere par lur enseignement. Par le feu que issi des bouches au chevaus est signifié coveitesse a quei turne le prechement as herites ; par la fumée orgueil ; par le suffre luxure. De ces treis pecchiez sunt armé li chevaler, et de ceus trois pecchiez sont corrumpu une grant partie des genz de ce munde. Ceo que la poesté au chevaus est en lur bouches et en lur keuves signefie que, par fause doctrine et par essaumple de mauvese vie et de males overes, deceverent il les autres (ch. ix, 16—19).

Ceo signefie que li deable prent compaignie des princes del munde et de eus efforce sa bataille encuntre seinte Glise. Par ceo que la beste resembla lepard, que est de diverse color, sunt signefié li herite et li ypocrite que sunt de divers entendement en error, et mauvés dedenz et aperent bon dehors. Par les pates de urs sunt signefié li cruel ravisseur ; par la gule del leon les menaces as orguillus poessanz[1] (ch. xiii, 1—3).

Ceo que les flueves et les funteinnes devindrent sanc par la fiole au tierz angele que est espandue signefie que ceus serunt dampné que unt corrumpu les escriptures et unt turné la douçur del espiritel entendement en ordure de charnel seus, si comme funt li herite et cil qui preeschent por temporeus choses, et cil qui turnent l'euvangile en pleiderie (ch. xvi, 4).

La bouche au dragun signefie l'enticement au diable ; la bouche de la beste les parolles Antecrist ; la bouche au faus prophetes, la fause doctrine de ces preescheors et des herites. De ces trois issent iii espiriz orz ; ces sunt orguil, coveitisse et luxure. Icez resemblent reenes, kar il habitent en ord liu, et par le cri de lur fause doctrine tolent as autres lur repos (ch. xvi, 13).

Par ces ii poeples [Gog and Magog] qu'il trait premierement sunt signefié tuit li deciple Antecrist. Par Gog sunt signefié cil qui nuisent privéement, si come les herites que ore sunt. Par Magog sunt signefié li herite qui lors precheront apertement, et li tyrant qui ocirront ceus qui ne se voudrunt renaer (ch. xx, 7).

Ici sunt escommeniez li felun Gius pullant ki renient la veraie lestre de S. Escripture, et li herites mescreanz qui la corrumpent par faus entendement et li faus decretite qui torne S. Escripture, que est de espirite, a pleiderie por ces temporeus choses gaanier, et li faus preeschor qui preeschent pur veine gloire et por terrienes richeces (ch. xxii, 18, 19).

Probably by the false preachers mentioned in the last extract are intended rather the schismatics or heretics than preachers within the Church, but whether this is so or not, there is no doubt that the writer aimed at abuses within the Church as well as without. This is proved by his reference to false prelates and false clerks, of which several instances have already been cited[2]. The following extracts relate to the same subject:

Par le ymage de la beste sunt signefié li faus prelat qui sunt fet par le conseil et l'enticement de ceus qui querent ces temporeus choses. Li espirite de parler que est doné al ymage signefie le poer de maufere qu'il recevent par l'acheisun de la dignité. Ceo que cil sunt ocis qui ne voelent aorer le ymage signefie que erraument sunt escomigez et tenuz meintenant por rebelles cil qui ne voelent consentir au mauvés prelaz (ch. xiii, 14, 15).

La yveresce a la femme du sanc as seinz signefie la grant venchance que Nostre Sire prendra des tyranz qui unt espandu le sanc des bons crestiens, ou ceo signefie

[1] In this passage the commentator seems to apply Haymo's interpretation to contemporary events.

[2] See the extracts from the Commentary on ch. xiii, 16, 17; xiv, 9—11; xvi, 14; xvii, 1, 2, on pp. 451, 2 *supra*.

la greve venchance que Nostre Sire prendra de la grant luxure et dou grant boban qui li faus clerc meinent del patremoene au crucefix (ch. xvii, 6).

Le governeur et le mariner signefient les prelaz en seinte Glise, granz et petiz, qui aiment hautesce terrienne. Ceo qu'il mistrent poudre sur lur chief signefie qu'il mistrent coveitise de terrienes choses et richesses sur lur queors en lur pensée, ou ce signefie repentance tardive (ch. xviii, 17—19).

Ceo ke li marchant furent prince signefie que li haut homme du munde a force prennent la ou il ne deussent rien prendre si pur lur servise nun, si come li chevaler pur le pais garder et defendre, li prelat et li precheur pur le poeple Deu enseigner et endoctriner; ou ce signefie que cil qui les autres deussent governer et garder funt quanque il funt pur loyer et par seignurie (ch. xviii, 23).

Preaching is a subject to which the French commentary draws special attention by numerous references. 'Predicatiun,' 'preescher,' or 'prechement' are mentioned thirty-six times and 'preeschur' twenty-six times. We quote here some of these passages:

Par sa bouche sunt signefié li bon preeschur (ch. i, 16).

Par les toneires sunt signefiez les manaces del jugement que Dieu fet par ses preescheors. Par la voiz, la promesse de gloire; par les foudres les miracles; par la grant terremote est signefié l'aspre vie que li preescheor meinent (ch. viii, 5).

Par l'egle[1] sunt signefié li prescheor qui voient loing et garnissent seinte Glise de granz tribulations que ele avera a la venue Antecrist, et nomeement ceus qui sunt trop doné al amur des terriennes choses (ch. viii, 13).

Par ses piez sunt signefié li bon preeschur qui vont de liu en autre por preescher la foi; cil sunt comme columpne de feu, kar il deivent sustenir les fiebles et espendre les refreidiz del feu de charité (ch. x, 1).

Cist dui tesmoing sunt Enoch et Helye, par qui sunt signefié li autre bon preeschor a qui Nostre Sire premet sa grace, et amoneste qu'il ne faillent en petite adversité, quant cil durrunt tant en si grant persecution. Ceo qu'il serront covert de sacs signefie que li preeschur et li prelat deivent doner essample de penance as autres. Ceo qu'il sunt dui olive signefie qu'il deivent estre plein de misericorde. Ceo qu'il sunt candelabre luisant signefie qu'il deivent les autres enluminer par bone doctrine et seinte et par bone essample. Ceo qu'il sunt en estant signefie qu'il ne deivent prendre des choses temporeus fors lur sustenement, si come dist li apostle S. Pol: 'Si nos eum dont nos seum nurri et covert, seum de ceo paé.' Ceo que le feu istra de lur bouches et devorera les enemis, signefie qu'il se deivent combatre de espée espiritele, ceo est la parole Dieu que est feu, et ne mie par poer terrienne. Par la pluie del ciel sunt signefié les manaces as orguillus puissanz, ke li bon preescheor unt poer de clore, qu'il ne saent cremuz. Par les eves sunt signefié li luxurius, qui li bon preescheor tornent en sanc, quant il les font cognoestre lur ordure. Par la terre sunt signefié, li aver, que li bon preescheor firent de toutes plaies quant il les funt tout guerpir et suffrir meseises por Dieu (ch. xi, 3—6).

La semence dont ele est grosse est la parole Dieu. L'anguisse qu'ele a d'enfanter signefie l'apreté de vie que li bon preeschur aveient por les autres convertir. Le crier signefie le preeschement (ch. xii, 2).

Par le autre angele volant par mi le ciel sunt signefié li preescheor Nostre Seignur, ki, par les eles de bien enseigner et de bien ovrer, sunt plus haut des autres en Seinte Glise, et vunt de liu en autre por preescher l'euvangile de vie pardurable a totes genz, et creindre Deu comme seignur, et lesser les maus a fere pur lui, et lui honorer par bone vie et par bien fere (ch. xiv, 6, 7).

Li secund angele ki dist: Chaet est, chaet Babyloine, signefie que li preescheor garnissent seinte Glise et li dient que la gent del munde, que est signefié par Babyloine, charront en dampnation de cors et de alme pur les pecchiez qu'il funt et pur les mauveses essamples dunt il enivrent les autres (ch. xiv, 8).

[1] Compare the Authorised with the Revised Version.

Le overture del temple signefie que les secrez de Seinte Glise sunt demustrez par les preescheurs que sunt issu en toutes terres (ch. xv, 5).

These extracts show that the French Commentary was composed at a time when the spirit of Antichrist was believed to be abroad—when the Church was being attacked by false brethren within and heretics without—but at a time when good preachers were going about from place to place and in all lands, exhorting men to uphold the true faith and preaching the 'gospel of everlasting life[1].' Avarice, luxury and pride are prevalent sins; the prelates are proud, they seek after temporal things and abuse their powers[2]. The 'faus religius' and 'aesez clers' live in luxury and voluptuousness[3]. The false decretists turn Holy Scripture into 'pleiderie' for temporal objects[4]. Not only haughty prelates but also princes, tyrants and the great and rich men of the world are denounced as enemies of the faith[5]. Riches and other temporal things are frequently referred to and represented as a snare[6]. The ten kings who shall make war with the lamb (*Rev.* xvii, 12—14) represent those who now are warring against Holy Church and compelling her to pay tallage[7]. The 'sage (or "bone") gent de religiun,' or 'sage religius,' are held up as examples of an austere and holy life[8]. Towards the end of the world the religious shall increase and men shall despise earthly glory for hope of the glory everlasting[9]. At what period, within the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, do these conditions apply to the Church?

[1] The expression 'l'euvangile de vie pardurable' is a gloss upon the Scriptural text which in the French version runs: 'qui a l'euvangile que tuz jurz durra.'

[2] See, in addition to the passages of the French Commentary quoted above, ch. ii, 8—11, 12—17; v, 6; vi, 8; viii, 7; xii, 4, 16; xiv, 6, 18, 20; xviii, 1—3, 8; xx, 11. As to 'faus crestiens,' see ch. iii, 15; vi, 8, 13; xi, 2; xvi, 19.

[3] *Ibid.* ch. xvii, 2, 6. The passage 'Par la lumiere de lanterne est signifié boban de biau servise du siècle en hostel' (ch. xviii, 23), may refer to the extravagance of monastic bodies vying with each other in the lavish entertainment of visitors.

[4] Ch. xxii, 18, 19; xvi, 4. M. Meyer thinks that the commentator is here aiming at those who debase the preaching of the Gospel to the profession of an advocate, devoting themselves to it for the profit which they hope to obtain. Delisle and Meyer, (Vocab.) 137.

[5] *Commentary*, ch. v, 6; vi, 4, 12; ix, 10, 16; xi, 13; xii, 3; xiii, 1; xiv, 1, 20; xvi, 2, 12, 14, 16; xvii, 2, 6, 12; xviii, 9, 23, 24; xx, 7.

[6] *Ibid.* ch. i, 7; ii, 22; iv, 2; vi, 8; viii, 7, 13; ix, 10; xi, 4, 5, 7, 10; xii, 1, 9, 16; xiii, 8, 11, 14—15; xiv, 16, 20; xvi, 2, 4, 12, 15; xvii, 1, 2, 4, 8, 14; xviii, 1—2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 19, 21; xx, 13; xxi, 8, 21, 23; xxii, 18—19.

[7] See the passage p. 452 *supra*; and see further p. 462 *infra*.

[8] *Commentary*, ch. i, 14; iv, 7; x, 1; xiv, 2; xxi, 20.

[9] 'Creistra la religiun & guerpiront terrienne gloire pur esperance de cele gloire pardurable' (*Com.* ch. xxii, 24). The old English translation (Brit. Mus. Roy. 17 A. xxvi) runs: 'The religius of God schulen wax more & more and men schul forsake worldly blisse for hope of the blisse aboue.'

II.

Towards the end of the twelfth century, in Italy, France and Spain, where the Romance language was spoken, many causes contributed to a demand for a translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular. The preaching of St Bernard in the language of the people had paved the way. A general expectation of the fulfilment of prophecy in the coming of Antichrist and the Day of Judgement, the evil condition of the clergy bringing religion into contempt and calling aloud for reform, the songs of the Troubadours denouncing the clergy and advocating religious liberty, the prevalence of what came to be called the Albigensian heresy, whereby the Scriptures were perverted and the authority of the Church was denied[1]; all these causes combined to stir men's minds and promote enquiry after the truth as contained in Holy Scripture[2]. In 1170 Peter Waldo founded the sect known as 'The Poor Men of Lyons' or Waldenses, whose basis was a life of poverty and the teaching of the Scriptures. Waldo had the Bible, or a great part of it, translated into the Romance language and submitted the work to Pope Alexander III. The matter was considered at the third Lateran Council in 1179, and Waldo was forbidden to preach or expound the Scriptures. The Waldenses continued to preach, notwithstanding, and were excommunicated by Lucius III in 1183[3]. In April 1198 Innocent III issued a mandate of outlawry against the heretics, naming, amongst others, the Waldenses[4]. In July 1199 Innocent, writing to the Bishop of Metz, condemns preaching by the laity and women, but seems not to disapprove of the study of the Scriptures in the vernacular. He expresses ignorance of the life and opinions of those who have made the translation, and directs the Bishop to report who was the author of it and what was his intention, of what faith were those who used it, what was the motive of the teaching, and whether the teachers reverenced the Apostolic See and the Catholic Church[5].

By 1206 the influence of the heretics had so greatly increased that the Pope's legates who had been sent to the Province of Narbonne to

[1] In the thirteenth century the Albigenses, Catarini, Patarini, etc. were called in official documents simply 'the heretics.' If the Waldenses were included they were mentioned separately (S. R. Maitland, *Albigenses and Waldenses*, 96). Perhaps the latter are represented by the 'faus cristiens' mentioned in the French Commentary: 'Ceo que poosté lui est donnée sur quatre parties de la terre signefie qu'il a segnourie sur Gius et sur paens, herites et faus cristiens' (*Com.* on ch. vi, 8).

[2] See Gilly, *The Romaunt version of St John's Gospel*, pp. xvii—xix.

[3] Neander trans. Torrey, *Hist. of the Christian Religion*, VIII, pp. 353 etc.; S. R. Maitland, *Albigenses and Waldenses*, p. 176.

[4] *Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. I, No. 94.

[5] *Ibid.* Lib. II, Nos. 141, 142.

contend with them were about to turn back in despair. However, by the advice of Diego, Bishop of Osma, in Castile, and his companion, St Dominic, lately a Canon of Osma, who met the legates at Montpelier, the latter were induced to renew their efforts, and profiting by the example of the heretics, they dismissed their retinue, formed a body of preachers which included Diego and Dominic, and went about from place to place in absolute poverty, preaching the Gospel and confuting the errors of the heretics[1]. The institution of this mission was enjoined by Innocent III's letter to his legate dated November 17, 1206, 'ut contra hereticos insurgentes in provincia Narbonensi praedicatores instituat[2].' In a letter of December 21 Innocent refers to the evils rampant in the Church and compares the heretics and false brethren to the black horse of the Apocalypse upon which the Devil sits[3]. Innocent was apt to turn to the Apocalypse for his similes. He refers to the heretical churches as belonging to the Synagogue of Satan[4], compares the heretics with the locusts that came out of the smoke of the pit[5], and likens the Count of Toulouse to the red horse with whom was joined the black horse of heresy[6].

The doctrine of the Waldenses contained none of the more mischievous errors of the Cathari and other heretics, and Innocent III seems to have been hopeful of bringing them back to the true fold. In 1207 Durand de Huesca, a leader of the Waldenses in Arragon, was converted to the faith, it is supposed by Dominic, and brought with him a number of followers who, under the sanction of Innocent, formed themselves into a body of missionary preachers with the title of 'Pauperes Catholici.' They lived a life of poverty and devoted themselves to reclaiming the heretics. Durand is said to have written several tracts against his former heresy[7]. He and his followers were treated with special favour. On December 17, 1208, Innocent wrote to the Archbishop of Tarragona recommending Durand to him, and by a letter of the same date the Pope granted to those of Durand's counsel who should be engaged in secular business that they should not be compelled to go to war against Christians or to take an oath in secular matters, but without prejudice to the rights of others[8]. In a

[1] See Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, pp. 140—2.
[2] *Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. IX, No. 185.
[3] *Ibid.* Lib. IX, No. 208.
[4] *Ibid.* Lib. I, No. 94.
[5] *Ibid.* Lib. II, No. 99.
[6] *Ibid.* Lib. XVI, No. 167.
[7] Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, p. 246.
[8] *Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. XI, Nos. 196—8. 'Going to war against Christians' may imply that Durand's followers were not to be called upon to fight against their brother Waldenses, who, if heretical in some of their opinions, were professing Christians.

letter of April 3, 1209, to the Archbishop of Milan, Innocent refers to Durand as his 'dilectus filius.' In reply to a complaint of the Archbishop of Narbonne that Durand acts unfaithfully, deceives the Church of Rome and eludes canonical discipline, Innocent writes on July 5, 1209, recommending moderation towards him, and he writes in similar terms to the Archbishop of Tarragona. He writes also to Durand and his brethren that they are accused by the Archbishop of Narbonne and other bishops of boasting of the Pope's favour and being insolent to them and of being guilty of heretical practices, and he expostulates with him on these points. In May 1210 Innocent addresses Durand and his brethren as 'dilecti in Domino filii' and grants them protection. On the same date he writes to the Archbishops of Narbonne and Tarragona recommending his beloved son Durand to their protection, and commands the last-named prelate and his suffragans not to repel him[1]. In 1212 Durand and the Pauperes Catholici were still under the Pope's protection[2]. Thenceforward little is heard of them[3] but the example of their preaching and their poverty was not lost upon the founders of the two great mendicant orders which were soon to come into existence.

St Dominic's birthplace was in Old Castile, the country from which one of the two Latin versions of the French commentary came[4]. He was born in 1170. We have seen how, in company with his bishop, he visited Montpelier and joined in a mission of poor preachers in 1206[5]. When the bishop returned to Spain in 1207 Dominic remained behind and became sub-prior of Prouille, where he had founded a community of women. From 1207 to 1214 Dominic preached among the heretics of Languedoc. In the latter year he gathered a band of workers for whom a citizen of Toulouse provided a house and the bishop of the diocese an endowment of a portion of the tithes. This enabled the missioners to purchase books and other necessaries and to qualify themselves for preaching, which was their main object[6]. The Pope's approval was obtained in 1215, but Innocent died in July of that year, and his successor Honorius III finally sanctioned the Order of Fratres Prædicatores in December 1216. In 1220 the Dominicans followed the Franciscans in adopting a vow of poverty. Dominic died in 1221. The members of his Order were not, like monks, devoted to contemplation, but were trained to an active life, to study theology and rhetoric, and

[1] *Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. XII, Nos. 17, 66—69, Lib. XIII, Nos. 63, 77, 78.
[2] *Ibid.* Lib. XV, Nos. 82, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96.
[3] In 1237 Gregory IX orders them to be reformed. In 1247 Innocent IV restrains them from preaching (Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, p. 248).
[4] See p. 446 *supra* and Delisle and Meyer, CXLVI. [5] p. 457 *supra*.
[6] Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, p. 251.

to mix with the world—preaching to save souls[1]. They also spent much time in reading the Scriptures and writing books[2]. Dominic is supposed to have written two books against the Albigenses and commentaries on the Psalms, St Matthew's Gospel and St Paul's Epistles[3]. In 1217 he dispersed his followers to preach in Paris and Bologna and in Spain; in Paris they founded the convent of the Jacobins[4]; about 1221 they settled in London and in Oxford. Their convents were real houses of study[5].

The Franciscans, whose Order of Fratres Minores was in an elementary stage in 1210[6], were from the first required to live according to the Gospel in obedience and chastity without possessing property. Faculties for preaching were to be issued by the head of the Order, but no brother was to preach without the sanction of the bishop of the diocese[7]. St Francis discouraged the acquisition of learning. One of the rules of the Order was: 'Let the brethren who cannot read be not anxious to learn, but rather let them seek to have the spirit of the Lord.' St Francis died in 1226. It was not until some years later that his followers took to study, some of them becoming teachers at the Universities[8]. The members of both Orders preached, and the members of both professed poverty, but preaching was the special object of the Dominicans, as indicated by their title, and poverty was the watchword of the Franciscans.

The relation which the Dominican bore to the Franciscan is shown by Matthew Paris' report of the dispute about precedence between the two Orders in 1243[9]. According to him the Preachers argued that they had deservedly obtained their name and office from their preaching, and were more truly distinguished by the apostolic dignity; the Minorites alleged that they had chosen a more rigorous and humble life, and so the more worthy because more holy. If we search for our author amongst the Friars we shall expect to find him amongst the Dominicans rather than the Franciscans. Albertus Magnus and St Thomas Aquinas, who incorporated Gilbert de la Porée's prologue, or the substance of it, in their commentaries on the Apocalypse, were both Dominicans. A modern writer has thus expressed himself with regard to the early

[1] Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, p. 252.
[2] S. R. Maitland, *Albigenses and Waldenses*, p. 397.
[3] Drane, *Hist. of St Dominic*, p. 475; Guiraud, *St Dominic*, trans. K. de Mattos, p. 159.
[4] Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, pp. 254—5.
[5] Guiraud, *ut supra*, p. 160.
[6] See p. 446, note 5 *supra*.
[7] Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, pp. 257—60.
[8] Cuthbert, *The Friars*, pp. 49—52.
[9] *Chronica Majora* (Rolls Series), IV, p. 279.

Dominicans, 'Un autre trait caractérise les premiers essais de la prédication dominicaine. Pauvre, car ce n'est pas en vain qu'ils portent le nom de Mendicants, c'est contre les riches et les puissants de la terre, contre leur luxe, leurs plaisirs et leurs vices qu'ils exercent leur zèle apostolique. Ils ont aussi emprunté aux Pères de l'Église latine, des peintures plus sombres du monde futur, le retour plus fréquent des idées de damnation et d'enfer[1].' The 'puissants' of the earth, by that description, are attacked in the French Commentary[2] and the many references to 'judgement,' 'damnation' and 'hell,' including the notion that the elect will rejoice at the torments of the wicked, point to the author's having been influenced by the gloomy doctrines of the Dominicans[3].

That the author was a regular and not a secular seems to be proved by his attacks on 'the false prelates and false clerks[4],' and by his upholding the 'bone gent de religion' and the 'sages religius[5].' The Albigensian Crusade, when the north of France was arrayed against the south for twenty years to suppress heresy at the point of the sword, or the years following the Crusade, must have been present to the mind of the author whose commentary contains so many references to 'the heretics.' We have shown that this title represented all the heretics of southern France except the Waldenses[6]. When the Crusade came to an end in 1229 heresy was for a time suppressed in southern France, but it continued to flourish in some of the cities of north Italy, especially Milan, until or beyond the middle of the century. Avarice, luxury and pride, within or without the church, are condemned by the French Commentator; Innocent III, in a sermon preached before the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, proclaimed that the corruption of the people had its chief source in the clergy[7] and the decrees of that Council make stringent regulations for the reform of the clergy. The poem called *Gera pigra*, written about 1219 but referring to the time of Innocent III, is a satire against the pride, luxury and irreligion of the

[1] L'Abbé Bernard, *Les Dominicains dans l'Université de Paris*, p. 484.

[2] *Com.* on ch. v, 5; vi, 4; xi, 6.

[3] It has been said that the Franciscans appealed to love, the Dominicans to fear (Kington, *Hist. of Frederick II*, I, 78). 'Judgement' is referred to 29 times, 'damnation' 27 times, and 'hell' 21 times in the French Commentary. There are five passages referring to the share which the saints are to have in the judgement of the wicked. One of these is as follows: 'Le manger et les chars des uns et des autres signifie la grant delit que seint averont au jugement des tormenz a dampnez' (ch. xix, 18). See also the Commentary on xiv, 17; xviii, 6, 20; xix, 21. This doctrine was enunciated by Gregory the Great and quoted with approval by Peter Lombard in the twelfth century (Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, I, p. 240).

[4] See p. 453 *supra*.

[5] See p. 455 *supra*.

[6] See p. 456, note 1 *supra*.

[7] Innocent III, *Sermones de diversis, Sermo VI.*

French hierarchy[1]. Joachim of Floris, who died in 1202, exposed the worldliness of the clergy and spoke of the prelates, proud and defiled, as opposed to the good prelates, simple minded and humble of heart[2]. Peter Cantor, who died in 1197, in his *Verbum Abbreviatum* of 153 chapters, attacks the abuses in Church and State[3]. His work is instructive in the manners and customs of that age. Matters were much in the same condition as they had been in the time of St Bernard. That great preacher had spoken out very plainly: 'They are ministers of Christ and they are serving Antichrist. They are advanced to honour upon the goods of the Lord, and to the Lord they render no honour at all. From this proceeds that meretricious splendour, that habit fit for a comedian, that magnificence almost royal which you see every day. Because of this you see gold upon the bits of their horses, upon their saddles and even upon their spurs; yes, their spurs shine more brightly than their altars. Because of this you see fine tables loaded with splendid services of plate, chased goblets, and also with viands correspondingly costly. Then follow merry makings and drunkenness, the guitar, the lyre and the flute. Thence come groaning winepresses and storehouses full and overflowing with all manner of good things. Thence come vases of rich perfumes and coffers filled with immense treasures. It is for the attainment of such objects that they desire to be and are Provosts of Churches, Deans, Archdeacons, Bishops, Archbishops. For these dignities are not given for merit but are disposed of in that infamous traffic which walketh in darkness[4].' Of the lower orders of the clergy he says: 'The evil living of the clergy, the mother of which is episcopal negligence, is everywhere disturbing and weakening the Church. The bishops give what is holy to dogs and cast pearls before swine who turn again and rend them. But it is only right that they should have to suffer from those that they foster. They do not correct those whom they enrich with the goods of the Church, and therefore they are grieved and wearied with their misconduct[5].'

We see here that with regard to the corruption of the clergy the attacks of the author of the French Commentary are as applicable to the twelfth century as to the thirteenth, and the same thing may be said with regard to the heretics, who were condemned by the Third Lateran Council in 1179 and by the Council of Toulouse in 1119[6]; but

[1] Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, v, p. 252 note.
[2] Fournier, *Études sur Joachim de Flore*, pp. 8, 9; Joachim, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, fo. 119a.
[3] Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. ccv, cols. 21—368.
[4] Mabillon, *Works of St Bernard*, trans. Eales, iv, pp. 223—4.
[5] *Ibid.* ii, p. 479. [6] S. R. Maitland, *Albigenses and Waldenses*, pp. 90, 175.

one distinguishing mark of the French Commentary is the frequent reference to preachers and preaching. It is alive with the spirit of the early part of the thirteenth century. The attempt was to be made to conquer heresy and purify the Church by the spiritual weapons of preaching and the example of a life of poverty. Preaching and the renunciation of earthly riches are themes on which the French Commentator dwells persistently[1]. One passage relating to current events seems, above all, to have a material bearing on the date of the work. This passage is quoted on p. 452 *supra* and forms the commentary on chapter xvii, *vv.* 12—15. It is thus rendered in the old English translation[2]:

> And these ben the kyngis that undirlyngis bee to anticrist and bitokeneth the grete lordyngis of this world that thorough envye weren agen goddis commandements. Alle thei have oon counseil, that is the counseil of the world for to taken with right & with wrong of her underlyngis and of here neighebores. Her vertu and her power their schulen deliveren to the beeste; for alle here eld al here wit thei hav dispendid in the develis service. And as the kyngis undur Anticrist schulen fighten agenne the lomb and his membris for to bynymen them the right beleve that thei hav in Jhesu Crist, right also tho that ben now fighten agenst holi chirche & not oonli in bodili thingis but in goostli also, for thorough the taliage that thei maken thei bryngen the symple folk in to synne.

This passage suggests a great lord who not only makes profit out of his lay subjects, but also levies taxes on the clergy, who is at war with the Church spiritually and temporally and who breaks all or most of the ten commandments. Two monarchs may be suggested as answering to this description. One is King John of England; the other is the Emperor Frederick II.

Before John had been a year on the throne he had a violent quarrel with the heads of some of the Cistercian houses in Yorkshire because they claimed exemption from the plough tax. In January 1204 he levied a tax of a seventh of moveables which fell upon all classes, including the clergy. In 1207 he proposed a tax to be levied on the holders of ecclesiastical benefices to which the bishops replied that the Church could not submit to a demand which had been unheard of in previous ages. John substituted a demand of a thirteenth of the moveables of the laity which was unwillingly granted; he then proceeded to collect the thirteenth from the clergy also. Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, forbade the clergy of his province to comply, and, having excommunicated all who should pay the tax as well as the collectors of it, fled

[1] As to preaching see p. 454 *supra*. As to earthly riches see the Commentary on ch. ii, 10, 22; iv, 2; viii, 7, 13; ix, 10; xi, 4, 7, 10; xii, 1, 9, 16; xiii, 8, 11, 14, 14—15; xiv, 16, 20; xvi, 2, 4, 12, 15; xvii, 1, 2, 4, 8, 14; xviii, 7, 8, 15, 19, 21; xx, 13; xxi, 8, 21; xxii, 18, 19.

[2] Brit. Mus. Roy. 17 A. xxvi.

over sea[1]. John thereupon seized the goods and revenues of the archbishop. By letter of Dec. 18, 1207[2] Innocent III directed the Bishops of Worcester, Ely and Hereford to expostulate with the king and, if this should be ineffectual, to lay the province of York under an interdict. Meanwhile John's refusal to accept Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury was widening the breach with the Church, and in March 1208 the whole realm was laid under interdict. The spoiling of the Church went on. John argued that as the clergy were unable to perform their duty they were no longer entitled to receive any remuneration, and so seized upon their revenues[3]. In 1211 John was supplying his brother-in-law, Count Raymond of Toulouse, with means to resist the Albigensian crusaders. In June or July of that year the Pope's legates pronounced sentence of excommunication upon John, absolving his subjects from their allegiance and enjoining upon them obedience to the leader of any host which the Pope might send into England. In 1212 John levied £22,000 from the Cistercians for the help they were alleged to have given to the enemies of Count Raymond, and the English clergy were forced to acknowledge by deed that all the money John had received from them since his accession was a free gift. In January 1213 Innocent directed Philip Augustus of France to expel John from his realm and assume the sovereignty of England; he also directed other European princes to join Philip, and all who took part in the expedition were to enjoy the privileges of pilgrims to the Holy Sepulchre. In the following May John submitted and surrendered the realm to the Pope. In June 1214 an aid was levied for the relaxation of the interdict, and the bishops were compensated for their losses. The lower clergy and the religious houses were ignored, and the king obtained from some of them an acknowledgment that their contributions during the period of the interdict had been voluntary[4].

In a sense John was warring against the Church from the beginning of his reign until his submission to the Pope, and if the passage we have quoted from the French Commentary does in fact refer to John it

[1] Miss Norgate, *John Lackland*, pp. 73, 101, 125—7; Ib. 'Geoffrey of York' in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* The passage quoted above, 'for thorough the taliage that thei maken thei bryngen the symple folk in to synne,' suggests a possible connection with the Archbishop's excommunication of all who should pay the tax as well as the collectors of it. The Archbishop's complaint was that the king 'ab ecclesiis et eleemosynis Eboracensis provinciæ tertiam decimam disposuisset recipere,' and 'non solum de dominio ipsius et ab ipso tenentibus, sed etiam a religiosis et plerisque clericis Eboracensis provinciæ tertiam decimam suorum proventuum contra ecclesiasticam libertatem recepit' (*Innocent. III Regest.* Lib. xi, No. 87).

[2] *Ibid.* Lib. x, No. 172.

[3] Miss Norgate, *John Lackland*, p. 128.

[4] Miss Norgate, *John Lackland, passim.*

is probable that the work originated between March 1208, when the interdict was imposed, and his submission in May 1213. Perhaps the latter part of that period is to be preferred because the teaching of Dominic had had time to spread and John's quarrel with the Church entered upon an acute stage after his excommunication in June or July 1211.

If the Emperor Frederick was in the mind of the commentator it brings us to the very end of the period which the authorities allow for the composition of the work[1]. Frederick's first breach with the Church was in 1227 when, having set out on the Crusade to the Holy Land, he returned three days later on the plea of illness and was excommunicated by Gregory IX for so doing. In his sermon on the occasion Gregory complained that the bark of St Peter was assailed by the armies of the infidels; by the rage of tyrants, 'who assert their temporal claims, proscribe justice, and trample under foot the liberties of the Church'; by the folly of heretics; and by the perversity of false brethren. In the following year Frederick was under a similar sentence for embarking afresh without the Pope's sanction. In Palestine the Emperor gained possession of the Holy Sepulchre by diplomacy, and having crowned himself king in Jerusalem, he returned to Italy in July 1229. Meanwhile his territory had been ravaged by the Pope's army and a crusade had been preached against him by the Pope's emissaries, the Friars. He was also accused of having caused some Dominicans and Franciscans to be dragged through the streets of Jerusalem because they preached on Palm Sunday. In June 1229 Gregory issued a bull of excommunication against the Cathari, Publicans, Poor men of Lyons, Arnoldists, and lastly the Emperor Frederick. In September 1230 the Pope and the Emperor exchanged the kiss of peace, and thenceforward until 1239 there was no open rupture between them. One of the terms of peace was that tallage was not to be levied from the clergy. The failure to comply with this condition was alleged as one of the causes of the Emperor's excommunication in 1239[2]. At this time the regular clergy, high and low, were no better than in the days of St Bernard; they were avaricious and immoral. In March 1239 Gregory again pronounced sentence of excommunication against the Emperor, gave his body to Satan (that his soul might be saved), absolved his subjects

[1] See p. 446 *supra*.

[2] See Gregory IX's bull and the letters set out by M. Paris (*Chronica Majora* (Rolls Series) III, pp. 535, 556, 570, 601; IV, p. 451) and compare the French Commentary on ch. xvii, 12—15, p. 452 *supra*. The oppression of clerks by collections and tallages is one of the grounds of the sentence of deposition against Frederick in 1245.

from their allegiance, laid under interdict every place he might be in, and degraded any ecclesiastic who should perform service for him. He was accused of stirring up insurrection in Rome, arresting a Cardinal, keeping benefices vacant, seizing the goods of churches, levying taxes on the clergy, imprisoning and banishing them, putting them to death, ill-treating, plundering and expelling from his realm all partisans of the Church, favouring the Saracens, settling them among Christians, obstructing the recovery of the Holy Land, rejecting the interposition of the Pope in the affairs of the Lombards and other offences. Frederick, in reply, appealed to the Commonalty who had been stirred to hatred of him by the Dominicans and Franciscans. The Pope began his manifesto in rejoinder: 'Out of the sea is a beast arisen whose name is all over written "Blasphemy"; he has the feet of a bear, the jaws of a ravening lion, the mottled limbs of the panther. He opens his mouth to blaspheme the name of God and shoots his poisoned arrows against the tabernacle of the Lord and the Saints that dwell therein[1].' Blasphemous sayings attributed to the Emperor were spread abroad by the Friars. Gregory complained that the German princes and prelates despised the papal anathema and adhered to Frederick. In 1240 the legate Albert von Beham was invested with full power to excommunicate them. The Bishop of Freisingen recommended the Pope, whom he calls 'This Roman priest,' to feed his own Italians: 'We, who are set by God as dogs to watch our own folds, will keep off all wolves in sheep's clothing.' The Canons of Ratisbon boasted that they would keep six hundred knights in the field for three years for the honour of Frederick and the Empire. The Bavarian clergy said they did not fear the thunders and lightnings of Rome, nor would they give a bean for the sentence of suspension and excommunication. The Dean and Chapter of Passau preached a crusade against the Pope's legate. The legate excommunicated prelates and princes, who laughed at the sentence. The legate wrote to the Pope in 1241 that if help were not sent most of the princes and prelates of Germany would enter Lombardy and aid the Emperor[2]. While Gregory's action had the effect of driving many churchmen into the Emperor's camp, there was a great force

[1] *Rev.* xiii, 1—3. The Commentary on this, 'Ceo signefie que li deable prent compaignie des princes del munde et de eus efforce sa bataille encuntre seinte Glise,' etc. is quoted at p. 453 *supra*.

[2] In England the Pope's legate demanded a fifth of the revenues of the clergy towards the expenses of his war with the Emperor. While some of the bishops complied, the rectors of Berkshire withstood the exaction, alleging, amongst other reasons, that the Church of Rome had no right to tax the churches of other nations, and that the revenues of the Church ought not to be applied for the maintenance of war, especially amongst Christians (M. Paris, *Chronica Majora* IV, p. 38 *et seq.*).

working all over Christendom for the Church and against the Emperor. Gregory lavished favours upon the Dominicans and Franciscans and in every city, openly or secretly according to the circumstances, they were preaching the crusade against Frederick to all classes of people. Kington gives the substance of a typical sermon by a Friar[1]. The Emperor is described as the abomination of desolation—the man of sin—the Antichrist that should come—the Beast whom St John foretold, whose mark too many in Italy had received. It is not surprising that the Emperor banished the Friars from his dominions. The war went on. In 1241 the Emperor captured the fleet conveying prelates to the Council which the Pope had summoned to be held at Easter. Many prelates perished; the rest were made prisoners and suffered great privations. Gregory died in August 1241 and was succeeded by Celestine IV, who survived less than a month. Then for nearly two years the papal throne was vacant. In June 1243 Innocent IV was elected and proved even more obstinately determined to put down the Emperor than his predecessor had been. Like Gregory he was strongly supported by the Friars. In July 1244 Innocent fled to Lyons. In July 1245 Frederick was deposed by the Council of Lyons, and Henry of Thuringia was anointed King of Germany by German prelates who had deserted Frederick's cause. Henry died in 1247 and William of Holland was crowned in his place. The war continued with unabated fury and cruelty on both sides, Lombardy being the chief centre of hostilities. The Pope and the Emperor each believed that the other had been party to a conspiracy to murder him. In 1247, by Frederick's order, a near relation of the Pope and an object of his special affection was seized and hanged because the Pope had sent legates abroad to injure the Emperor's fame and dignity. In 1248 the Bishop of Arezzo, an active partisan of the Pope, was taken prisoner by Frederick and hanged before the walls of Parma, being dragged to the gibbet at a horse's tail. Three days later the Emperor's camp was destroyed by a sally from the town, his army was routed and three thousand of them taken prisoners. The learned Thaddeus of Suessa, who had acted as the Emperor's proctor at the Council of Lyons, was amongst the prisoners. He was hewn to death piece-meal. The war had become one of extermination and treaties were disregarded. Before leaving Tuscany in 1249 Frederick gave directions that the Friars were no longer to be imprisoned or banished; they were to be tied together like foxes and burnt alive. A Franciscan for preaching revolt in Sicily was

[1] *Hist. of Frederick II*, II, p. 123.

put to death after undergoing eighteen different kinds of torture. To Vatatzes, Emperor of Nicaea, Frederick wrote in 1250: 'What right has that Pope to send Minorites and Preachers to confer with the heads of your Church? He excommunicates you by name every day and calls all your subjects heretics....Whence did these priests of ours learn to fight against Christians, to exchange the pastoral staff for the lance, and the pen for the arrow? Look at our holy Cardinals carrying on war in our empire. One is called Duke, another Marquess, another Count. This one draws up armies, that one bears a battle axe. Did they learn this from Christ's first disciples or from any general council? Ought not these priests of infamy, these false prophets, to be burnt with fire as in the days of Elijah[1]? Such are the shepherds of Israel; what havoc have they not wrought in Germany, in Italy, in every land! But he who is lurking in Lyons is now held in scorn as the father of lies; his followers loathe his ways....Those friars who have been sent to you have not gone to discuss religion but to sow the tares of strife after their wonted fashion.' Well might Matthew Paris exclaim that those who read the annals of history had never found such an instance of intense and inexorable hatred as that which existed between the Pope and the Emperor. Frederick's struggle with the Church ended with his death in December 1250[2].

The language of the Commentary seems at first sight to be equally appropriate to the state of affairs in England from 1211 to 1213 and to that in the Empire from 1239 to 1250. The fact that all the early manuscripts of the Commentary came from England or the north of France[3] may be thought to point to King John as the subject of denunciation. But there is nothing to suggest that the author wrote in the midst of the turmoil or even near at hand. The work is not primarily a polemic but a Scriptural commentary composed, it may be, far away from the scene of strife and by an author who was a thoroughly orthodox son of the Church and sympathised with the members of his own Order who were actually engaged in the struggle. If the author meant to denounce any existing potentate, this was not his chief object but only incidental to the work. The probability that he was a Friar and the frequent reference to Antichrist (which had become an epithet of abuse on both sides), to the heretics, to the false prelates and false

[1] Frederick's recollection of the story was at fault; see 1 *Kings*, xviii, 38, 40.

[2] As to Frederick II my authorities are: M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, vol. vi; and, to a less extent, Kington, *Hist. of Frederick II.*

[3] Delisle and Meyer, i.

clerks[1], to the prelates and princes, to the tyrants[2], seem to point to the time of Frederick II. Like King John the Emperor had levied tallage on the clergy. The organisation of the Preachers, to whom the Commentary so often refers, was in an elementary stage in 1211–13; they were not incorporated in an Order and they had not been sent forth to preach 'to all nations[3].' Further, it will be observed that John never reached a state of actual warfare with the Church, while between Frederick and, first Gregory IX and then Innocent IV, there existed for several years a state of war to the death. On the whole it seems not unreasonable to conclude that the Commentary was composed in England or the north of France by a Dominican Friar, between 1239 and 1250.

J. C. Fox.

STREATLEY-ON-THAMES.

[1] See especially the reference (p. 453 *supra*) to the false prelates and false clerks who are enticed by the false doctrine of Antichrist or conform their life to that of his disciples.

[2] See the reference (Commentary on Rev. ch. xvii, v. 6, pp. 453, 4 *supra*) to the great vengeance which our Lord will take upon the tyrants who have shed the blood of the good Christians.

[3] See *Com.* ch. xiv, 6, 7; xv, 5.

ZWEI FRIEDERIKENLIEDER.

I.

'Erwache Friedericke...'

In der neuen Ausgabe des *Jungen Goethe* 2, 57 hat Morris aus dem ersten der Friederikenlieder drei Strophen herausgeworfen und 6, 155 dies mehr als radikale Verfahren zu rechtfertigen versucht, sich die Gründe, die Th. Maurer in einer in Kleinigkeiten richtigen, im Ganzen misslungenen Arbeit[1] gegen Goethes Verfasserschaft vorbringt, zu eigen machend. Es soll hier gezeigt werden, wie wenig stichhaltig diese Gründe sind, und dass das Gedicht mit allen seinen sechs Strophen von einem einzigen Verfasser herrühren muss.

Maurer und Morris empfinden einen Widerspruch zwischen der zweiten und sechsten Strophe: Hier singe die Nachtigall, dort schweige sie. Abgesehen davon, dass solch ein 'Widerspruch' noch lange nichts gegen die Verfasserschaft ein und desselben Dichters beweisen würde—eher das Gegenteil: Derjenige, der ein solch kleines Gedicht in der von Morris angenommenen Weise ausbaut, hütet sich weit mehr vor Widersprüchen als der ursprüngliche Autor—besteht hier nicht der geringste Widerspruch, und wer einen solchen empfindet, ist eben nicht fähig, Situation und Stimmung des Gedichts voll zu erfassen:

Horch Philomelens Kummer
Schweigt heute still
Weil Dich der böse Schlummer
Nicht meiden will.

Die Nachtigall, im Schlafe
Hast Du versäumt:
So höre nun zur Strafe
Was ich gereimt.

Die Nachtigall schlägt für die Liebenden, und diese lauschen des Nachts ihrem Gesange: Aber meine Liebste, sagt der Dichter, erfreut sich eines derart gesunden Schlafs, dass die Nachtigall das Singen für diesmal als zwecklos aufgegeben hat! Damit deutet er scherzhaft den Umstand aus, dass sie in diesem Augenblick tatsächlich schweigt: Es ist ja doch kurz vor Tagesanbruch, wo sie ihr müdes Köpfchen zum

[1] *Die Sesenheimer Lieder*, Eine kritische Studie von Dr Th. Maurer (*Beiträge zur Landes- und Volkeskunde von Elsass-Lothringen*, xxxii. Heft), Strassburg, 1907.

Schlummer senkt. Nachher nimmt er den Scherz natürlich nicht wieder auf: 'Zur Strafe dafür, dass du den süssen Gesang der Nachtigall versäumt, hast du jetzt meine schlechten Verse anzuhören.' Gewiss hat sie die ganze Nacht über gesungen, der Dichter *sagt* eben nur: 'Wenn du Böse nicht taub gewesen wärest für die Nachtigall, dann hätte sie weitergesungen.'

Unglaublich ist, was über den Umstand, dass die Nachtigall überhaupt in dem Gedicht vorkommt, und über den Namen 'Philomele geredet wird.' Der eine konstatiert, dass dieser Vogel erst 1774 in Goethes Lieder 'eintrete'; der andere, es hänge davon ab, ob an dem Ort, wo sich der Dichter gerade aufhalte, Nachtigallen vorkämen; und der dritte behauptet gar, der Name 'Philomele' erscheine 'sonst nicht' weiter bei Goethe. Wir verlangen in solchen Fällen zu hören, dass und warum eine Abneigung gegen den Namen bestanden habe, und erwarten die Behauptung 'kommt sonst nicht vor' in der präziseren Form: 'Ich habe Goethes sämtliche Werke auf den Namen Philomele hin durchgesehen und ihn nirgends gefunden.' Das zu schreiben wird so leicht niemand wagen.

Die Wendung 'Und wär er von den Zähen zum Kopf von Eis' soll gleichermassen 'ungoethisch' sein: Würde sie damit etwa lenzisch, dass dieser, sich an eine bekannte Virgilische Phrase anlehnend, einmal schreibt: 'Ach wie alles Eiss mir in der Brust war'? Ist dies letztere auch ungoethisch? Das Eigenartige waren gerade die Worte 'von den Zähen zum Kopf': Diese müssten zusammen mit den andern bei Lenz nachgewiesen werden, ehe man den Einwand wenigstens diskutieren könnte.

Warum wird neben die Worte 'Der Schlaf hat ihn verlassen, doch wacht er nicht' statt der Briefstelle von Lenz, 'Ich wache des Nachts mit schlafenden Augen,' nicht vorher jene berühmte Wendung aus dem Hohenliede, 'Ich schlafe, aber mein Herz wacht,' gehalten? Und wenn die Wiederholung des Bildes 'Die Nacht, die einer deiner Blicke zum Tage macht' in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* Goethes Verfasserschaft der ersten Strophe beweisen soll, warum dann nicht auch die Wiederholung der Worte 'Der Schlaf hat ihn verlassen, doch wacht er nicht' eben dort dasselbe für die fünfte? Es fehlt einem der Ausdruck wenn man sieht, dass die eine Stelle erwähnt und die drei Zeilen vorher stehende unterdrückt wird: 'Es war ein Zustand, von welchem geschrieben steht: "ich schlafe, aber mein Herz wacht"; die hellen wie die dunkeln Stunden waren einander gleich; das Licht des Tages konnte das Licht der Liebe nicht überscheinen, und die Nacht wurde durch den Glanz der Neigung zum hellsten Tage,' Sätze, die in einem einzelnen Absatz von sechs

Zeilen Länge zusammenstehen! Und nun vergleiche man die nächsten Absätze: Deutlich erweist es sich, dass Goethe an unser Gedicht gedacht hat! (W. A. 29, 57, 24—59, 2). Und nochmals: Wenn sich das 'blöde Licht' des Morgens an einer Stelle der *Pandora* widerspiegeln soll, warum nicht ein Blatt vorher auch das 'wachende Schlafen'?

> Phileros, nur dahin zum bedufteten Garten!
> Da magst du die Fülle der Liebe dir erwarten,
> Wenn Eos, die Blöde, mit glühendem Schein
> Die Teppiche röthet am heiligen Schrein...
>
> Was hilft es, und neiget das Haupt auch sich nieder,
> Und sinken ohnmächtig ermüdete Glieder;
> Das Herz es ist munter, es regt sich, es wacht,
> Es lebt den lebendigsten Tag in der Nacht!

(W. A. 50, 302, 71 ff., 300, 42 ff.) Man sehe sich wiederum die ganze Umgebung dieser Stellen an!

Auch das eingeschobene 'O Glück' in der fünften Strophe ist nichts für Lenz charakteristisches, es ist weiter nichts als eine 'Interjektion,' lässt sich bei vielen Dichtern nachweisen und war gleich andern Interjektionen vor allem bei Klopstock und seinen Gefolgsmannen beliebt, den Goethe wohl gradeso gut kannte wie Lenz. Aber man braucht, hat man den *Jungen Goethe* (2, 57) vor sich liegen, abermals nur ein Blatt umzuwenden, und findet im Gedicht *Es schlug mein Herz* in der vierten Strophe die Interjektion 'Ihr Götter!' und in der fünften den Schluss 'Und doch, welch Glück! geliebt zu werden, Und lieben, Götter, welch ein Glück!' Wo ist der Unterschied? Hier hat man zu ergänzen: 'Welch ein Glück ist es,' dort: '...wäre es.' Ich mache mich anheischig, aus Goethes Gedichten derartiger Ausrufe weit mehr als aus Lenzens zu sammeln. Und zu solcher Sorte von Beweisen finden sich überall schon in nächster Nähe die Gegenbeweise. Warum z. B. wird 'Dem Himmel wachs entgegen' nicht auch Lenz zugeschrieben mit Rücksicht auf 'Dir, Himmel wächst er kühn entgegen' (*Werke*, Blei, 1, 76)? Da wird man einfach die Bekanntschaft Lenzens mit Goethes Gedicht annehmen: Aber weshalb dann nicht auch bei den sogenannten Parallelen in seinen andern Gedichten und Briefen, die für Lenzens Verfasserschaft der drei Strophen sprechen sollen?

Man wird des Handels satt sein und lieber die positiven Gründe anhören, die für Goethes Recht vorzubringen sind. Binden die oben zitierten Stellenpaare aus *Dichtung und Wahrheit* und *Pandora* zwei von den beanstandeten Strophen, 3 und 5, mit 1 nachträglich und äusserlich zusammen, so lassen sich anderseits die Quellen nachweisen, aus denen gemeinsam die verschiedenen Strophen gespeist worden sind.

Ich werde dabei aus bestimmten Gründen etwas weiter ausholen als es für gegenwärtigen Zweck erforderlich wäre. Bedauerlicherweise steht mir Edward Schröders Untersuchung[1] nicht zur Verfügung.

Die Strophe zeigt von vornherein, dass wir wahrscheinlich anakreontische Töne mit Wendungen aus anakreontischen Gedichten zu hören bekommen werden. Ist es doch die Form, die in so vielen, vorab *An den Schlaf* o. ä. überschriebenen Gedichten, auch in ironisierenden Romanzen, von Gleim, Löwen, Schiebeler, Gerstenberg, Hagedorn, Eschenburg usw. erscheint. Von Haus aus aber ist sie französischen Ursprungs, und so finden wir sie bereits bei den deutschen Schülern Ronsards, gradeso wie die erweitere Form, vom Typus 'Ich denke dein, wenn mir der Sonne Schimmer / Vom Meere strahlt,' französischer Herkunft ist. Opitz's Gedicht,

Ach, Liebste, lass uns eilen,
Wir haben Zeit,
Es schadet das Verweilen
Uns beiderseit.

Der edlen Schönheit Gaben
Fliehn Fuss für Fuss,
Dass alles, was wir haben,
Verschwinden muss.

Der Wangen Zier verbleichet,
Das Haar wird greis,
Der Augen Feuer weichet,
Die Brunst wird Eis.

Das Mündlein von Corallen
Wird ungestalt,
Die Händ' als Schnee verfallen,
Und du wirst alt.

Drum lass uns jetzt geniessen
Der Tugend Frucht,
Eh' als wir folgen müssen
Der Jahre Flucht.

Wo du dich selber liebest,
So liebe mich,
Gib mir das, wann du gibest,
Verlier' auch ich,

ist solchen von Ronsard nachgebildet, aber das dem französischen Dichter Besondere besteht darin, dass der Gedanke 'Pflücket die Rose eh sie verblüht' fast immer an die Aufforderung des Jünglings an das Mädchen, am frühen Morgen, wenn der Tau an den Gräsern hängt, in den Garten zu gehen und zu sehn, wieviel neue Knospen sich erschlossen haben, geknüpft ist: ein Zug, der auf Ronsards Vorliebe

[1] *Die Sesenheimer Gedichte von Goethe und Lenz (Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1905, S. 51—115), im Buchhandel vergriffen.

für den *Roman de la Rose* beruht und mit einigen Abzügen noch in Goethes *Zueignung* erscheint. Ich wähle ein einziges Gedicht heraus:

Mignonne, allons voir si la rose
Qui ce matin avoit desclose
Sa robe de pourpre au soleil
A point perdu ceste vesprée
Les plis de sa robe pourprée,
Et son teint au vostre pareil.

Las! voyez comme en peu d'espace,
Mignonne, elle a dessus la place,
Las! las! ses beautés laissé cheoir!
O vrayment marastre Nature,
Puis qu'une telle fleur ne dure
Que du matin jusques au soir!

Donc, si vous me croyez, mignonne,
Tandis que vostre âge fleuronne
En sa plus verte nouveauté,
Cueillez, cueillez vostre jeunesse:
Comme à ceste fleur, la vieillesse
Fera ternir vostre beauté.

Dieser Gedanke ist nun auch in dem Sonett enthalten, das Goethen die Anregung zu seinem Friederikenlied gegeben hat:

Mignonne, levez-vous, vous estes paresseuse,
Ja la gaye alouette au ciel a fredonné,
Et ja le rossignol doucement jargonné,
Dessus l'espine assis, sa complainte amoureuse.

Sus! debout! allons voir l'herbelette perleuse,
Et vostre beau rosier de boutons couronné,
Et vos œillets aimés ausquels aviez donné
Hier au soir de l'eau d'une main si soigneuse.

Harsoir en vous couchant vous jurastes vos yeux
D'estre plustot que moy ce matin esveillée;
Mais le dormir de l'aube, aux filles gracieux,

Vous tient d'un doux sommeil encor les yeux sillée.
Ça ça, que je les baise, et vostre beau tetin,
Cent fois, pour vous apprendre à vous lever matin,

während ein anderes das Versmass hergab und weitere Züge lieferte:

Le jour pousse la nuit,
Et la nuit sombre
Pousse le jour qui luit
D'une obscure ombre.

L'automne suit l'esté,
Et l'aspre rage
Des vents n'a point esté
Après l'orage.

Mais la fièvre d'amours
Qui me tourmente
Demeure en moy toujours
Et ne s'alente.

Redonne la clarté
A mes tenebres,
Remets en liberté
Mes jours funebres.

Amour, sois le support
De ma pensée,
Et guide à meilleur port
Ma nef cassée.

Ne ma palle couleur,
D'amour blesmie,
N'a esmeu à douleur
Mon ennemie.....

Aber Goethe hat die Verse 5—8 des Sonetts bis auf den Anfang ganz beiseitegelassen, das Übrige, z. T. weiter ausgeführt, auf seine drei ersten Strophen verteilt, drei fernere hinzugefügt, und am Schluss den Schlussgedanken des Sonetts, gehörig geändert, angefügt:

Erwache, Friedericke,
Vertreib die Nacht
Die einer Deiner Blicke
Zum Tage macht.
Der Vögel sanft Geflüster
Ruft liebevoll,
Dass mein geliebt Geschwister
Erwachen soll.

Ist Dir Dein Wort nicht heilig
Und meine Ruh?
Erwache! Unverzeihlich!
Noch schlummerst Du!
Horch, Philomelens Kummer
Schweigt heute still,
Weil Dich der böse Schlummer
Nicht meiden will.

Es zittert Morgenschimmer
Mit blödem Licht
Errötend durch Dein Zimmer
Und weckt Dich nicht.
Am Busen Deiner Schwester,
Der für Dich schlagt,
Entschläfst Du immer fester
Je mehr es tagt.

Die ersten beiden Verse sind oben in den französischen Texten enthalten, 'Mignonne, levez-vous' und 'pousse la nuit.' Der dritte und vierte, in dem 'Redonne la clarté / A mes tenebres' vorgezeichnet, bieten eine allen Literaturen bekannte Wendung, obwohl sie gewöhnlich dahin geht, dass die Blicke des Mädchens andere Sterne überstrahlen. In einem zweiten Sonett Ronsards hat man beide Wendungen zusammen, nur dass an der zweiten Stelle nicht Nacht und Tag, sondern Winter und Sommer sich gegenübergestellt sind:

Je vey ma nymphe entre cent damoiselles,
Comme un croissant par les menus flambeaux,
Et de ses yeux, plus que les astres beaux
Faire obscurcir la beauté des plus belles....

Si qu'en despit de l'hyver froidureux,
Par la vertu de ses yeux amoureux
Un beau printemps s'engendra de sa face.

Oft hört man statt 'einer Deiner Blicke' zitieren 'jeder...' Diese Verbindung findet sich in Hagedorns Gedicht *Der Wink* (*Poetische Werke*, Bern, 1772, Bd. 4, 147), dessen Anfang übrigens dem Anfang unserer zweiten Strophe anklingt:

Ist gleich dein Wink verstohlen:
So find ich doch mein glücke
In jedem deiner blicke,
Der meine Hoffnung nährt.

Auch in Ramlers *Blumenlese* (1, 143) steht so ein Gedicht, *An die Nachtigall* überschrieben, wo die letzte Strophe lautet:

Dann kehre sie von Sehnsucht matt zurücke;
Noch nie gefühlte Glut durchwall' ihr junges Herz,
Sie lächle Zärtlichkeit aus jedem ihrer Blicke,
Und lindre meiner Liebe Schmerz.

Die Nachtigall soll die Geliebte herbeirufen, ihrem Liede zu lauschen! Aber 'einer' ist mit vollem Bedacht gesagt, was durch ein ferneres Sonett Ronsards veranlasst sein wird ('Pren ceste rose...'):

La rose et moy differons d'une chose;
Un soleil void naistre e mourir la rose;
Mille soleils ont vu naistre m'amour,

Dont l'action jamais ne se repose.
Ha! plut à Dieu que telle amour, éclose
Comme une fleur, ne m'eust duré qu'un jour!

Schliesslich noch eine Strophe als Zugabe:

L'honneur du ciel, est-ce pas ceste flame
Qui donne aux dieux et lumière et chaleur?
Ton ornament, est-ce pas la valeur
De son bel œuil, qui tout le monde enflame?

Vers 5 nennt die Vögel, die ihr Morgenlied anstimmen, nicht mit Namen wie das erste Sonett Ronsards und Hagedorns Gedicht *Der Morgen* (4, 191), das schon von andern dem Friederikenlied verglichen worden ist:

Uns lockt die morgenröthe
In busch und wald,
Wo schon der hirten flöte
Ins land erschallt.
Die lerche steigt und schwirret,
Von lust erregt;
Die taube lacht und girret,
Die wachtel schlägt....

Der schmelz der grünen flächen
Glänzt voller pracht,
Und von den klaren bächen
Entweicht die nacht.....

Im Sonett 'Mignonne, levez-vous' hörten wir, worauf sich die Worte in Vers 9 beziehen: Das Mädchen hatte versprochen, frühzeitig zu dem Geliebten in den Garten oder in die Laube zu kommen. In Götzens Lied *An die Laura* erscheint dasselbe Motiv:

Der schwühle Tag hat sich verloren,
Die Nacht ist hier:
O Laura! was dein Mund geschworen,
Das halte mir.

Sieh jenes Dach von Rebenblättern,
Wo niemand lauscht,
Wo du mit mir, vor allen Göttern,
Dein Herz vertauscht....

Selbst die Schauerromanze *Lykas und Myrrha* von Eschenburg, beginnend

Es war schon tiefe Mitternacht
In welcher fest des Schlafes Macht
Die Augenlieder band

vgl. Ronsard: 'le dormir de l'aube...vous tient d'un doux sommeil encor les yeux sillée'—mag herbeigeholt werden: Bietet sie in den ersten sechs Strophen überhaupt zahlreiche Bilder, die uns bisher begegnet sind, so fängt die sechste an:

Erwache!—rief sie—sieh mich hier,
Die treue Myrrha, die vor dir
Enteilt dem Grabe steht!

und die achte:

Denk, Lykas, wenn du nun erwachst,
An das, was schwörend du versprachst,
An mir verheissnes Glück!

Bei Ronsard hiess es doch: 'D'estre plustot que moy...esveillé,' und Goethes Zusatz 'Und meine Ruh,' der natürlich jetzt nichts anderes bedeutet als: 'Ich bin umsonst so früh aus den Federn gekrochen,' mag noch immer leise an die ruhelose Tote erinnern, die den wortbrüchigen Knaben wecken will. Ich weiss übrigens, das 'vor dir' in Wirklichkeit nicht zu 'enteilt dem Grabe,' sondern zu 'steht' gehört.

Die Verse 9—20 sind in ihren wesentlichen Zügen oben schon belegt. Als eigne Erfindung des Dichters könnte der in 21 f. erscheinende Zug angesprochen werden: Friederike wird, vorab wenn Besuch da war, mit einer der Schwestern zusammengeschlafen haben.

Aber bei Ronsard hiess es: 'le dormir de l'aube, aux filles gracieux,' in Höltys Gedicht *Auf den Tod einer Nachtigall*:

Da lauschete, da, da ward das Entzücken
Der Liebe laut,
Und schmachtend hieng an ihres Lieblings Blicken
Die junge Braut;
Sie drückten sich, bey jeder deiner Fugen,
Die Hand einmal,
Und hörten nicht, wenn deine Schwestern schlugen,
O Nachtigall!

und in einem neuen Sonett Ronsards, von Goethe zum Teil fast übersetzt:

Cache pour ceste nuict ta corne, bonne lune;
Ainsi Endymion soit tousjours ton amy,
Et, sans se réveiller, en ton sein endormy,
Ainsi nul enchanteur jamais ne t'importune.

Zwei Gedichte Günthers—es sind die beiden letzten der Sammlung von 1742, S. 1175 bis 1178—sollen uns zu der zweiten Hälfte des Friederikenlieds hinüberführen. Das zweite davon, *Der verliebte Kummer*, ähnelt auch in der äusseren Situation:

Die Liebe weckt an diesen Morgen
Den Kummer der verliebten Sorgen
Mit mir gar zeitig wieder auf,
Die Seuffzer wachen in dem Munde,
Die Thränen suchen aus dem Grunde
Des Hertzens ihren alten Lauf.

Die Schmiedin meiner süssen Kette
Zieht meine Faulheit aus dem Bette,
In welchem sie der Schlaff noch wiegt.
Ihr Auge schläfft, ich aber weine,
Die Einsamkeit sitzt auf dem Steine,
Der mir an meinem Herzen liegt.

Ach! denck ich, bringt dies nahe Scheiden
Von ihrer Brust ein solches Leiden,
Da nur ein Zimmer uns zertrennt;
Wer wird doch meine Wunden heilen,
Wenn Land und Lufft uns einmal theilen,
Und Schweidnitz mir kein Brod mehr gönnt?

Die Zähren mühn sich, meine Klagen
Mit stummer Sprache nach zu sagen,
Allein die Angst vertrocknet sie.
Ach! wem vertrau ich diesen Jammer?
Der freyen Lufft, der tauben Kammer?
Und beydes ist vergebne Müh'....

Sehr oft erscheint in den anakreontischen Gedichten der Gedanke, dass der Liebende des Mädchens Schlummer nicht stören wolle. Gerstenberg beginnt sein Lied *Das schlafende Mädchen*—schon Minor und

Sauer, *Studien zur Goethe-Philologie*, S. 33, machen darauf aufmerksam —mit den Worten:

Schlummre, schlummre sanft, o Schöne!
Stöhrt sie nicht, der Nachtigallen Töne!

Aber bei Goethe sieht der Liebhaber sein Mädchen nur im Geiste vor sich, und so kann er auch nicht genau so singen wie einer bei Ronsard ('Douce Maistresse, touche...'):

Maistresse, je n'ay garde
De vouloir t'éveiller,
Heureux quand je regarde
Tes beaux yeux sommeiller....

Ebensowenig träumt er sich wieder als weitverschlagenen Ritter neben Luna, um von dort herab in die Kammer zu schauen; aber er erinnert sich doch, dass er dies einst getan hatte:

Dämmrung wo die Wollust thront,
Schwimmt um ihre runden Glieder.
Trunken sinkt mein Blick hernieder.
Was verhüllt man wohl dem Mond.
Doch, was das für Wünsche sind!
Voll Begierde, zu geniessen,
So da droben hängen müssen;
Ey da schieltest du dich blind.

und damit vielleicht auch an die Romanze *Damon und Ismene* von Gleim, wo die Worte vorkamen:

Er gieng in jene Fernen,
Ihn deckt kein Grab;
Er wandelt unter Sternen,
Und sieht herab!...

Freund, sprach er, meine Schöne
Find ich einst dort....

und der Anfang lautete:

Ach Damon, ach Ismene!
Mein Herz ist weich!
Ach welche heisse Thräne
Wein ich um euch....

während ihm die ganze Strophe 4 durch die zweite eines Ronsard'schen Sonetts disponiert wurde ('Quand l'esté...')

Personne ne te void qui d'une couleur fade,
Ne retourne au logis ou malade ou pasmé,
Qu'il ne sente d'amour tout son cœur entamé,
Ou ne soit esbloüy des rais de ton œuillade.

Morris will wieder ohne Bedenken von dem handschriftlichen 'fehllos' zu dem falschen 'fühllos' der Drucke zurückkehren, Schröder verweist, um jenes zu halten, auf eine Stelle in dem freilich erst 1798

entstandenen *Blümchen Wunderschön*, wo sich der Ritter 'frei von bösen Fehlen' nenne. Aber in diesem Sinne würde es eine schon vorhandene Eigenschaft bedeuten, und der Gegensatz zu 'Und wär er...von Eis' wäre nicht ganz rein. Man erwartet die Bedeutung: 'ohne einen Fehler, einen Schaden davonzutragen.' Goethe wollte offenbar die Worte 'Personne ne te void qui...ne retourne ou malade ou pasmé' möglichst ähnlich wiedergeben, und das ist ihm aufs beste gelungen: 'fehllos' umfasst die beiden Begriffe 'malade' und 'pasmé,' indem es den gemeinsamen Komponenten eliminiert. Unter dies 'fehllos' subsummiert man das vorhergehende 'blind' und das folgende 'heiss,' wie es ja auch im französischen Text hiess: 'qu'il...ne soit esbloüy,' und vor allem in der vorhergehenden Strophe:

Quand l'esté dans ton lict tu te couches malade,
Couverte d'un lincueil de roses tout semé,
Amour, d'arc et de trousse et de fleches armé,
Caché sous ton chevet se tient en embuscade:

Amor bringt dem Neugierigen die Ver'letzung' bei. Man wird ja wohl nicht das folgende 'Qu'il ne sente' zugunsten des 'fühllos' unterstreichen: Hier folgt ein Objekt, 'pasmé' und 'malade' sind wie 'fehllos' absolut gebrauchte Adjektiva.

Ich seh Dich schlummern, Schöne,
Vom Auge rinnt
Mir eine süsse Träne
Und macht mich blind.
Wer kann es fehllos sehen
Wer wird nicht heiss—
Und wär er von den Zähen
Zum Kopf von Eiss!

Vielleicht erscheint Dir träumend—
O Glück!—mein Bild,
Das halb im Schlaf und reimend
Die Musen schilt.
Erröthen und erblassen
Sieh sein Gesicht:
Der Schlaf hat ihn verlassen,
Doch wacht er nicht.

Die Nachtigall im Schlafe
Hast Du versäumt:
So höre nun zur Strafe
Was ich gereimt.
Schwer lag auf meinem Busen
Des Reimes Joch:
Die schönste meiner Musen,
Du—schliefst ja noch.

An dem forcierten Bilde Vers 31 f. hat man oft Anstoss genommen. Ich erinnere dazu an die dritte Strophe in dem oben zitierten Gedicht von Opitz:

Der Wangen Zier verbleichet,
Das Haar wird greis,
Der Augen Feuer weichet,
Die Brunst wird Eis.

ferner an Kleists *Lied eines Lappländers* (*Werke*, Amsterdam 1765, Bd. 1, 70), das Goethe, wie 'Ich denke dein' beweist, genau kannte:

Komm, Zama, komm! Lass deinen Unmuth fahren,
O du, der Preis
Der Schönen! Komm! In den zerstörten Haaren
Hängt mir schon Eis....

Und solltest du, weit übers Meer, in Wüsten
Verborgen seyn:
So will ich bald an Gröndlands weissen Küsten
Nach Zama schreyn....

und das wie *Es schlug mein Herz* mit den Worten 'welch ein Glück!' schliesst. Diese gewaltsamen, elementaren Bilder finden sich auch in einem Sonett Ronsards:

Or' que le Ciel, or' que la terre est pleine
De glas, de gresle ésparse en tous endrois,
Et que l'horreur des plus froidureux mois
Fait herisser les cheveux de la pleine:

Or' que le vent, qui mutin se promeine,
Rompt les rochers et desplante les bois,
Et que la mer redoublant ses abois,
Sa rage enflée aux rivages ameine.

Amour me brusle, et l'Hyver froidureux
Qui gele tout, de mon feu chaleureux
Ne gele point l'ardeur, qui tousjours dure.

Voyez Amans comme je suis traité!
Je meurs de froid au plus chaud de l'Esté,
Et de chaleur au cœur de la froidure:

und noch stärker in Günthers vorletztem Gedicht, *Celinde an ihren ungetreuen Selimor*, das Goethen gewiss deutlich vor Augen gestanden hat:

Fliest ihr wohl bedachten Zähren!
Fliest ihr Zeugen meiner Pein!
Wo sich Glück und Wind verkehren,
Da verbleibt der Sonnenschein.
Das Verhängniss, dessen Triebe
Mich in Amors Garn gebracht,
Setzt dem Himmel meiner Liebe
Blut-Cometen in die Nacht....

Jeder Abend, jeder Morgen
Höret mein beweglich Ach,
Und das Heer der bleichen Sorgen
Folgt mir in das Schlaff-Gemach.
Meine Sehnsucht stirbt vor Kummer,
Die betrogne Hoffnung weint,
Wenn ihr ohngefehr im Schlummer
.....erscheint....

Selbst der Aufruhr von dem Blute,
Ungetreuer Selimor!
Rücket deinem Wanckelmuthe
Den begangnen Meineyd vor.
Dein entfärbtes Angesichte,
Das sich vor ihm selber schämt,
Zeigt, wie die verbothnen Früchte
Dir bereits die Hand gelähmt.

Kehre wieder, falsche Seele!
Eh dein Wechsel meinen Geist
Aus des Leibes Marter-Höhle
In die Ewigkeit verweist;
Prüfe nur das reine Feuer,
So durch meine Glieder laufft!
Es brennt warlich nicht auf heuer,
Sondern bis der Nil ersaufft...

Hier erscheint auch das beliebte anakreontische Motiv, das uns Strophe 5 des Friederikenliedes bietet. Aus einem guten Schock von Beispielen, die ich mir von Weckherlin bis Bürger notiert habe, seien die nächstgelegenen ausgewählt, die unter sich wieder enger zusammengehören. Bürgers Lied *An den Traum*, im Herbst 1771 gedruckt, entstand ungefähr um dieselbe Zeit wie unser Gedicht und ist auch im Versmass verwandt. War es durch Wallers[1] *Say lovely dream* angeregt, so hat es doch auch von Günthers *Aria zu einer Abendmusic* (S. 279) manches profitiert, deren Spuren wiederum in Hagedorns Goethen so gut bekanntem Gedicht *Die Alster* zu beobachten waren ('Befördrer vieler Lustbarkeiten...' 4, 204):

Befördert ihr gelinden Saiten
Den sanfften Schlummer süsser Ruh!
Rhodante legt die müden Glieder,
Der Arm wird schwach, das Haupt sinckt nieder,
Und schlägt die holden Augen zu.

Ihr angenehmen Nacht-Betrieger,
Ihr süssen Träume, schleicht herein....

Ergetzt sie mit den schönsten Bildern,
Die Schertz und Lieb erdichten kann....

Schon dies Gedicht haben wir auch dem unsern zu vergleichen. Ein anderes von Günther, *Schreiben an seine Magdalis* (629), bot die besondere Wendung, die in Goethes Versen 35 f., 44 ff. genommen wird, und dazu ein Wort in Vers 46:

Die Erde schläfft und ruht, ich aber wach' und träume,
Weil deine Liebe mich mit offnen Augen wiegt.
Ich schreib und weiss nicht was: Du siehst es aus dem Reime,
Der nun aus Schweidnitz kommt und lahme Füsse kriegt.

[1] Bezeichnenderweise sagen alle Herausgeber: 'Walkers,' der eine schreibt vom andern ab, und keiner sucht das Gedicht einmal selbst auf.

Das Joch der Einsamkeit schlägt meinen Leib darnieder,
Dem Nacht und Finsterniss die müde Seite schleusst:
Die ungewohnte Streu fühlt selbst den Schmertz der Glieder,
Die ein verborgnes Weh von ihrem Lager reisst....

Schliesslich noch ein paar Verse aus Gleims Gedicht *An den Schlaf, auf der Doris Nachttisch gelegt*:

Dann so lass der Schönen auf mein Flehen,
Bald im Traum doch dessen Bildniss sehen,
Der nach ihr schon tausend Seufzer schickt....

Der Anschluss an solche Vorbilder hat hier aber nicht wie so oft zu Inkongruenzen in Goethes Strophen geführt.

Auch in den anakreontischen Gedichten sollte das 'Bild' häufig blass oder bleich erscheinen: doch nur, damit diese Jammergestalt die Schläferin rühre und sie endlich Erhörung gewähre. In Günthers Gedicht dagegen ist das 'entfärbte Angesicht' Ausdruck der Scham und der Reue:

Selbst der Aufruhr von dem Blute,
Ungetreuer Selimor!
Rücket deinem Wanckelmuthe
Den begangnen Meineyd vor.
Dein entfärbtes Angesichte,
Das sich vor ihm selber schämt,
Zeigt, wie die verbothnen Früchte
Dir bereits die Hand gelähmt....

Mutatis mutandis, hat man in unserer fünften Strophe in dem 'Erröthen und erblassen' die in Scham und Ärger wechselnde Stimmung des Dichtenden zu verstehen, dem die Geliebte ihr Wort gebrochen hat (vgl. Vers 9). Aber dies ist nicht die unmittelbare Ursache dazu. Auch die auf das Kolon (Vers 38) folgenden Verse 38 f. bieten diese Ursache nicht direkt, sondern erst einmal den Grund für denjenigen Umstand, der sie im Gefolge gehabt hat: Zwar ist der Mann wach, aber der Dichter, der volle Gebrauch seiner dichterischen Kräfte ist nicht zugleich aufgewacht. 'Ich wache, aber mein Herz schläft': das Gegenteil des biblischen Worts. Dies Manko, behauptet er, dies nicht völlige Wachsein habe ihm das Reimen schwer gemacht, und das ist der Grund, warum er sich schämt und ärgerlich ist, errötet und erbleicht. Wie anders, wenn sie ihr Wort gehalten hätte und bei ihm wäre, die 'schönste seiner Musen,' die ihm die Gabe mühelosen poetischen Gestaltens bringt! Das war es ja doch, was alle Leute am jungen Goethe bestaunten und rühmten.

Je veux Muses aux beaux yeux,
Muses mignonnes des dieux,
D'un vers qui coule sans peine
Louanger une fontaine.

Sus donc, Muses aux beaux yeux,
Muses mignonnes des dieux,
D'un vers qui coule sans peine,
Louangeons une fontaine,
C'est à vous de me guider,
Sans vous je ne puis m'aider,
Sans vous, Brunettes, ma lyre
Rien de bon ne sçauroit dire,

begann Ronsard eine seiner Oden, 'Muses mignonnes!' Und in Hagedorns Gedicht *An den verlohrenen Schlaf* (4, 105):

Mein alter freund, mein schlaf, erscheine wieder!
Wie wünsch ich dich!
Du sohn der nacht, o breite dein gefieder
Auch über mich;
Verlass dafür den wuchrer, ihn zu strafen,
Den trug ergötzt:
Hingegen lass den wachen Codrus schlafen,
Der immer reimt und immer übersetzt,

ist es zwar nicht so ganz sicher, ob mit dem Codrus der Dichter einen Rivalen—vgl. Vergil, *Eclog.* 5, 11—oder sich selbst gemeint hatte: aber Goethe wird Selbstironie darin empfunden haben. Auch für die Voranstellung der Apposition, 'Die schönste meiner Musen, Du schliefst,' zeigt sich hier das Vorbild: 'Mein alter Freund, mein Schlaf, erscheine....' Vgl. auch oben S. 453: 'Die Schmiedin meiner süssen Kette.'

Ronsards Sonett begann: 'Mignonne, levez-vous, vous estes paresseuse,' und endete: 'pour vous apprendre à vous lever matin.' In solchen kleinen Rahmen hat auch Goethe sein Gedicht eingeschlossen. Daraus ergibt sich in den letzten beiden Strophen ein etwas künstlicher Chiasmus: 35 f. × 47 f., 37 f. × 45 f., 39 f. × 43 f. Sehr hübsch aber bindet der heitere Gegensatz, der zu 43 f. eingefügt ist—'Was ich gereimt: Die Nachtigall'—den Schluss an den Anfang des Gedichts.

Wenn man wie Maurer und Morris empfindet, mag man ein Dutzend Kombinationen mit einer bis sechs Strophen herstellen und an jeder seinen Spass haben: wir andern kennen nur eine Gestalt des Gedichts, die von Goethe selbst ist, und aus der wir nicht einen einzigen Vers abgeben wollen[1]. Man denke sich doch einmal die Strophen 2, 4, 5 weg.

[1] Man wird nicht verlangen, dass ich auf bare Redensarten eingehe (Maurer 25): 'In der Tat (Strr. 1, 3, 6) ein Gedicht, in dem nichts Wesentliches vermisst wird, ein Gedicht, das des apollinischen Dichterjünglings würdig ist. Dieser frische, bei aller Weichheit starke Ton, diese gesunde, hoffnungsfrohe Grundfarbe. Wo (Str. 2) blieb (!) das schlicht-schöne Ethos, das die Goetheschen Verse adelt, der liedartige Charakter des Ganzen? Hier finden wir nervös aufgeregte, übertreibende Deklamation, rhetorische Mittel, wie Fragen und Ausrufe, und infolgedessen einen zerhackten Rhythmus. Das ist ein völlig anderes Genus von Dichtung. Dort die Verschwisterung mit der Musik, hier mit der Beredsamkeit (!). Es kann kein Zweifel sein: der Abschreiber Lenz ist zu Wort gekommen' u. dergl. Zeugs mehr.

Wie sollte der junge Mann dazu kommen, die Schläferin schon vor Tage aus dem Bett zu trommeln, und ihr zu zürnen, dass sie nicht erwachen wolle: wenn sie ihm nicht versprochen hätte, ihn im Garten zu treffen! Ich sehe von der engen Verbindung, die durch die französische Quelle zwischen den ersten zwei Strophen hergestellt wird, ganz ab. Und würde anderseits Strophe 6 wirklich passen, wenn nicht Strr. 4 und 5 voraus-, und zwar unmittelbar vorausgegangen wären? Passen auf Maurers 'von schlicht-schönem Ethos geadelte liederartige' Strophen die Worte: 'So höre nun zur Strafe / Was ich gereimt / Schwer lag auf meinem Busen / Des Reimes Joch'? In seinem Sinne jedenfalls nicht, und in unserem nicht in dem Umfange, dass die andern Strophen zu entbehren wären.

Offenbar haben Maurer, Morris und W. A. 5, II 216 dies in eben dem Grade selbstironische wie für Friederike schmeichelhafte Gedicht gar nicht verstanden, haben den Wald vor Bäumen nicht gesehen. Und auch Schröders, wie ich schon aus den dürftigen Auszügen bei Maurer sehe, an sich völlig zutreffende Ausführungen über die Reime sind bei diesem Gedicht nicht ganz am Ort: Der Dichter spottet ja doch selbst über seine Reime. Ich weiss nicht, ob nicht schon lautlich 'Friedericke': 'Blicke' anstössig war, aber den Reim 'schlagt': 'tagt,' macht er sicherlich nur mit Humor: Reim dich oder ich fress dich. Doch das sind ein oder zwei schlechte Reime. Erst die nächsten Strophen machen das Gedicht zu einer Strafe dafür, dass Friederike nicht der Nachtigall gelauscht hat: 'Schöne': 'Träne,' 'rinnt': 'blind,' 'sehen': 'Zähen' (absichtlich!), 'heiss': 'Eiss' sind zum Teil lautlich schlecht, zum Teil trivial im höchsten Grade. Gellert (*Werke*, Leipzig, 1784, Bd. 1, 316) hatte einmal ähnliches Geschreibsel kritisiert und dabei verlangt: 'Der Reim ist der Sklave, und der Poet der Herr. La Rime est une esclave, et ne doit qu'obéir.' Auch in Goethes Gedicht ist es umgekehrt, ist der Reim der Herr, und der Dichter der Sklave.

Wie in aller Welt käme er hier zu seiner Träne, wenn er nicht auf Schöne reimen wollte, und umgekehrt. Auch dass er seine eigne Träne wie Günther die Kette süss nennt, ist doch reine Ironie, er nimmt von der Anakreontik Abschied. Und nachher, in der sechsten Strophe selbst, bringt er den abgedroschenen Reim 'Busen': 'Musen'! Die Reime der vierten Strophe sind geradezu unentbehrliche Voraussetzung für den Inhalt von Strophe 6. Und Strophe 5, inhaltlich in ergötzlichem Gegensatz zur vorhergehenden stehend, bildet die Brücke: Erst sieht er sie, das süsse Geschöpf, wie es in strammer Gesundheit, in kerngesundem Ganzschlummer daliegt; und dann soll sie ihn sehen: 'O Glück,'

d. h. Es wäre wirklich zu wünschen, dass Dir die Jammergestalt vor Augen trete!

Das lustige Geschäft, sich auszudenken, wie das Erlebnis zugestandegekommen ist, dem die Sesenheimer Muse die hübsche Gabe verdanken sollte, bleibt unserer Phantasie überlassen.

II.

'Dem Himmel wachs entgegen...'

In dem oben herangezogenen Gedichte von Günther, *Der verliebte Kummer*, fängt die sechste Strophe an:

Schnitt ich mein Elend in die Linden,
Erzehlt ich es den sanfften Winden,
So seh ich überall Gefahr....

Die Sitte, Namen oder Verse in die Rinde eines Baumes einzuschneiden, übten schon die Alten. Ich gebe nur aus ihrer Literatur ein paar Beispiele.

In der ersten Ekloge des Calpurnius Siculus ist ein Gedicht von nicht weniger als 56 Zeilen (33—88) eingeschaltet, das in einen Baum geschnitten ist!

Virgil, *Ekl.*, 5, 13 sind es ebenfalls 'Carmina':

Immo haec, in viridi nuper quae cortice fagi
Carmina descripsi et modulans alterna notavi,
Experiar....

Ebendort 10, 53 'amores':

Certum est in silvis, inter spelaea ferarum
Malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores
Arboribus; crescent illae, crescetis amores.

Bei Properz 1, 18 'amores':

Vos eritis testes, si quos habet arbor amores,
Fagus, et Arcadio pinus amica Deo.
Ah, quoties teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras,
Scribitur et vestris *Cynthia* corticibus!

In der *Anthologia latina*, I 248 'nomen':

Quando ponebam novellas arbores mali et piri,
Cortici summae notavi nomen ardoris mei;
Nulla fuit exinde finis vel quies cupidinis:
Crescit arbor, gliscit ardor, ramus implet litteras.

Eine besondere Wendung bei Theokrit, *Id.*, 18:

Γράμματα δ' ἐν φλοιῷ γεγράψεται (ὡς παριών τις
Ἀννείμῃ) Δωριστί· ΣΕΒΟΥ Μ'. ΕΛΕΝΑΣ ΦΥΤΟΝ ΕΙΜΙ.

Zu den Goethe am besten bekannten klassischen Werken gehören Ovids *Heroiden*. Da steht in Oenone's Brief an ihren ungetreuen Knaben Paris (5, 21 ff.) der folgende Passus:

Incisae servant a te mea nomina fagi:
Et legor *Oenone*, falce notata, tua:
Et quantum trunci, tantum mea nomina crescunt:
Crescite, et in titulos surgite recta meos.
Populus est (memini) fluviali consita ripa,
Est in qua nostri litera scripta memor.
Populе, vive precor, quae consita margine ripae,
Hoc in rugoso cortice carmen habes:
Cum Paris Oenone poterit spirare relicta,
Ad fontem Xanthi versa recurret aqua....

Vers 3 erinnert hier an Hagedorn, *Unverdiente Eifersucht* (4, 100):

Name, wachse mit den rinden!
Wachse, denkmal meiner hand!

Das Ganze aber an die letzte Strophe eines in Ramlers *Blumenlese* (1, 97) stehenden anakreontischen Gedichts, *Das ungetreue Mädchen*:

Sie grub in eine Rinde
Mit eignen Händen ein:
Wer untreu wird, der finde
Sein Grab in diesem Hain.
Schont, Götter, schont Ismenen,
Die selbst ihr Urtheil spricht;
Mein Tod soll euch versöhnen,
Straft nur Ismenen nicht!

Dieser letztere Gedanke findet sich nun auch in der zweiten Hälfte von Goethes Epigramm:

Dem Himmel wachs' entgegen
Der Baum, der Erde Stolz!
Ihr Wetter, Stürm' und Regen,
Verschont das heil'ge Holz!
Und soll ein Name verderben,
So nehmt die obern in Acht!
Es mag der Dichter sterben,
Der diesen Reim gemacht!

während die erste, worauf Minor und Sauer (a. a. O. 39) hinweisen, sich an Verse Cronegks anschliessen (Lpzg, 1771: 2, 39. 327. DjG², 6, 160):

Kein Nordwind und kein Sturm
Zerstöhr das heilge Grün.

Verzeih, o Baum, wenn deine heilgen Rinden
Die Hand verletzt, die Chloens Namen schreibt!

Es schützet dich vor den erzürnten Winden...
Des Himmels Blitz trifft deine Scheitel nie.

Den Brauch, der Geliebten Namen in die Rinde einzugraben, hatte Goethe schon in Leipzig geübt. Hier aber trat ein neuer Zug hinzu: Nach der Überlieferung soll er (W. A. 5, II 221) unsern Spruch auf

eine an einer Buche befestigte Tafel unter die Namen der Familie Brion und 'vieler guter Freunde' geschrieben haben. Diesen Zug bietet nun wieder das folgende, von gewissen antiken Mustern (s. oben) beeinflusste Sonett Ronsards:

Je plante, en ta faveur cet arbre de Cybelle,
Ce pin, où tes honneurs se liront tous les jours:
J'ai gravé sur le tronc nos noms et nos amours,
Qui croistront à l'envy de l'escorce nouvelle.

Faunes, qui habitez ma terre paternelle,
Qui menez sur le Loir vos danses et vos tours,
Favorisez la plante et lui donnez secours,
Que l'esté ne la brusle et l'hyver ne la gelle.

Pasteur qui conduiras en ce lieu ton troupeau,
Flageollant une eclogue en ton tuyau d'aveine,
Attache tous les ans à cest arbre un tableau

Qui tesmoigne aux passans mes amours et ma peine.
Puis, l'arrosant de laict et du sang d'un agneau,
Dy: 'Ce pin est sacré, c'est la plante d'Helene.'

Aus einem andern ist die Wendung 'Dem Himmel wachs' entgegen' übersetzt:

Afin que ton honneur coule parmi la plaine
Autant qu'il monte au ciel engravé dans un pin,
Invoquant tous les dieux et respondant du vin,
Je consacre à ton nom ceste belle fontaine....

Natürlich ist nicht daran zu denken, dass die Namen alle auf der Tafel gestanden haben (W. A. 5, II 221 f. gegen Minor und Sauer 40): Sie waren, Goethes Name dabei zu unterst, in der Baum geschnitten, und darunter die Tafel mit dem Epigramm angebracht. Eher noch möchte ich glauben, dass Goethes Name unter dem Gedicht mit auf der Tafel gestanden habe, die eben gegenüber dem Stamm das Vergängliche war: Die Natur macht keine Unterschiede bei den in den Stamm geschnittenen Lettern, aber die Tafel soll der Hirt bei Ronsard alle Jahre erneuern.

Bei Gelegenheit sollen auch die andern Friederikenlieder noch besprochen, soll weiter gezeigt werden, auf welche Art Goethe mit Ronsard bekannt geworden war. Auch in späterer Zeit lassen sich Spuren der Ronsardlektüre nachweisen. Solche aus dem Jahre 1805 z. B. hatte ich schon aufgefunden, bevor ich aus Weimar hörte, dass Goethe vom 5. März bis 25. April 'Ronsard, *Oeuvres*' von der Bibliothek entliehen hat. Den Anlass zu dieser Arbeit verdanke ich einem Winke der Goethekennerin Fräulein Antonie Meyer, Schwester von Eduard und Kuno Meyer: Schon die erste schnelle Durchsicht von Ronsards Werken lieferte mir dann die Gedichte, die in Betracht kamen.

G. Schaaffs.

St Andrews.

THE PROLOGUE TO CHAUCER'S 'LEGEND OF GOOD WOMEN' IN RELATION TO QUEEN ANNE AND RICHARD.

Of the many problems presented to us in the *Legend of Good Women*, one of the most interesting, and at the same time one of the most illusive, is that of the relation of Alceste to Queen Anne in Prologue B. From the publication of Ten Brink's *Studien* in 1870 to the publication of Mr Lowes's article in 1904, the theory of an allegorical identification was universally accepted[1]. Mr Lowes, however, opposed the identification of Anne and Alceste. His objections to it were supplemented by the argument Professor G. L. Kittredge made against the identification in 1909[2]. Meanwhile, however, in 1907, Mr Lowes's position had been challenged by Mr Tatlock, who attempted, as he said, 'the rehabilitation and extension of the old and orthodox theory of a personal compliment to the queen' paid through Prologue B, and removed from A[3].

Tatlock's argument is without question the strongest that has been made in favour of the identification of Alceste and Queen Anne, and deserves careful consideration. Stated briefly it is somewhat as follows. (1) That some living woman is symbolised by the daisy and Alceste in B is to be inferred from the use of the pronouns 'she' and 'her' in referring to the flower, and from the warmth of personal devotion expressed by the poet in his treatment of the daisy. (2) The French and Italian poems that served as Chaucer's models are known to have been addressed to real ladies; are we to believe that Chaucer, although he surpassed his originals in warmth of speech, had in mind no one more real than a heroine of Greek myth? (3) That he should have

[1] Mr Lowes's article is printed in *Publications of the Modern Lang. Ass. of America*, XIX, 593 ff. His note on page 666 gives a convenient list of references to previous opinions on this question. Tatlock, in his *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, p. 103, gives some additional references.

[2] *Modern Philology*, VI, 435 ff.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 102. The connection of the *Legend* with the queen is treated in pp. 102—120.

intended Alceste to symbolise Queen Anne in the B Prologue is not surprising, considering that the queen, in all probability, dictated to Chaucer the subject of the poem, and that Chaucer dedicated it to her. (4) Finally, the theory of an identification of Alceste and the queen in B accounts more satisfactorily than any other for the peculiarities of revision presented in A[1].

The limitations of space make it impossible to consider all of these arguments in detail, but it could easily be shown that Mr Tatlock's first, second, and fourth arguments are very far from conclusive[2]. It is in his third argument that the real strength of his position consists. Even if we disallow the assumption that the *Legend* was written at the queen's command (an assumption for which there is, after all, very little

[1] Since my own article is not at all concerned with *proving* that the B Prologue is the original version and that A is the revision, I shall take this hypothesis for granted in what follows. The arguments that have been presented in favour of this opinion by Mr Lowes and Mr Tatlock are, as it seems to me, ample justification for this course.

[2] Tatlock's first and second arguments were very satisfactorily met (in anticipation of such objections) by Lowes, *l.c.*, pp. 670—674. His fourth argument cannot receive adequate consideration within the limits of a foot-note, and I shall have to content myself with indicating its inconclusiveness in the briefest possible manner. Tatlock, after comparing the two prologues (pp. 86—102) and showing in a very convincing manner that, from the structural point of view, A is notably superior to B, reserves for further discussion three difficulties: 'the abolition in version G of almost all the warm feeling, and with it many excellent passages; secondly, the giving up of the suspense as to who is the lady of the Balade, and the lady who comes with the God of Love; and thirdly, the fact that, although she is repeatedly named in G, Chaucer at the very end affects not to know who she is. Without the connection with the queen, all these I believe to be quite inexplicable; with it all seems clear' (p. 115). Now the decrease in warmth of feeling is the result, first of a number of minor changes, the omission or revision of a line or two here and there; and secondly, of the omission of B 84—96 and B 101—118. The minor changes need cause us no difficulty, for Chaucer could not have made the numerous and important structural changes which Tatlock shows him to have made, without sacrificing many details that were charming in themselves but did not fall in easily with the new plan. As to B 84—96, it is quite as satisfactory to assume that they referred originally to the daisy, and that Chaucer omitted them because they seemed a little extravagant, as it is to assume that they referred to Anne and that Chaucer omitted them because he wished to efface from the poem all traces of its original occasion. For the propriety of addressing such lines to the queen is as questionable as the propriety of addressing them to the daisy. Nor is the omission of B 101—118 made more intelligible by the assumption of an allegorical identification of Alceste and Anne. For when we compare the two versions at this point we see that these lines are a digression in B and that the insertion of A 85—88 in their place is actually an improvement. It is Tatlock's opinion (to take up the second difficulty that he would solve on the hypothesis that Alceste is a symbol for Anne) that in B Chaucer sings his balade, not in praise of Alceste, but in praise of Anne (p. 108), and that this explains the rebuke the God of Love administers to him in B 537—541. This is improbable in itself, and is inconsistent with B 241—248, 255, 270—281, which prove clearly that Chaucer sings the balade about the lady who enters with the God of Love, Alceste. As to the fact that Chaucer appears at the end not to know who Alceste is, this difficulty exists in both versions of the prologue, for in both B 432 and A 422 Alceste announces her identity in the presence of the poet: 'I, your Alceste, whylom quene of Trace.' It is in this line that the real difficulty lies, and not in A 179, 317. In dealing with this difficulty we are not in the least aided by assuming that Alceste is the queen. For Tatlock himself (pp. 119, 120) finds it necessary to assume that Chaucer's failure to know Alceste at the end, is a mere slip in B, which Chaucer forgot to remove in A. But this, surely, is begging the question.

evidence)[1] we know that Chaucer wrote the poem with the intention of presenting it to the queen when finished. The lines:

> And whan this book is maad, yive hit the quene
> On my behalfe, at Eltham, or at Shene[2],

make this perfectly certain. It is therefore not merely excusable, but eminently proper, that we should expect to find the poem, and especially the Prologue, adapted to the purpose of complimenting the queen who was to read it.

Now, as Professor W. A. Neilson has suggested to me, the choice of Alceste as the Queen of the God of Love is in itself evidence of Chaucer's adaptation of his material to the purpose of complimenting Queen Anne. Since the poem was to be presented to her, it was fitting that the place of highest honour in the Court of Love should be given to a heroine who had distinguished herself for the particular kind of virtue exemplified by the queen, namely, faithful and loving wifehood. Instead of Venus, or Iseult, Chaucer chose as the 'kalender'

> To any woman that wol lover be[3],

Alceste,

> For she taughte al the craft of fyn lovinge,
> And namely of wyfhood the livinge,
> And alle the boundes that she oghte kepe[4],
>
> She that for hir husbonde chees to dye,
> And eek to goon to helle, rather than he[5].

This interpretation appears eminently probable, because we cannot attribute the choice of Alceste to convention[6]. On the contrary, it is quite counter to the courtly love tradition with which the *Legend* is so closely connected. Courtly love was extra-conjugal; its first law, as laid down by Andreas Capellanus, was: 'Causa coniugii ab amore non est excusatio recta[7].' Here Chaucer departs from tradition, and from

[1] For Tatlock's argument in favour of this assumption see his pp. 111—114. The evidence he cites, however, is ambiguous. We may grant that if Chaucer wrote the *Legend* at the command of the queen, Lydgate might very well have known of the fact. On the other hand, if Chaucer did not do so, Lydgate was quite capable of guessing, on the basis of B 496, 497, that he did. If Chaucer utters his 'And, for to maken shortly is the beste' more often than he does in other works of the same length, we must remember that the writing of the legends involved a great amount of condensation, and must therefore have consumed an amount of time out of proportion to their actual length. Whatever force there may be in the argument based on Chaucer's expressions of haste and weariness, is more than offset by the difficulty of explaining why, if Chaucer was compelled to continue the *Legend* against his will, was he not obliged to finish it? and why, if he disliked it so much, did he take up the *Legend* again after the queen's death, when he was free from the obligation (if it ever existed) of completing the work?

[2] B 496, 497. [3] B 543. [4] B 544—546. [5] B 513, 514.

[6] 'The function of Alcestis as the queen of the God of Love, as well as her transformation into a daisy, is original with Chaucer' (Neilson, *Origins and Sources of the Court of Love*, p. 145).

[7] *De Amore*, ed. Trojel, Havniae, 1892, p. 310.

his own normal practice (witness the *Troilus*). Not only is Alceste the chief lady of the Court of Love, but she prescribes that Chaucer shall make a glorious Legend

> Of Gode Wommen, maidenes and wyves,
> That weren trewe in lovinge al hir lyves[1].

I think we can scarcely doubt that this emphasis on *wifely* virtue is the result of Chaucer's adaptation of the love vision to the purpose of complimenting the queen.

If we accept this suggestion there is no need to assume an allegorical identification of Alceste and Queen Anne, and we are free from the difficulties involved in such an identification, although at the same time we hold to the notion of a compliment paid to the queen through the medium of Alceste. That there are grave difficulties in such an allegorical identification is undeniable. Among those to which Professor Kittredge called attention in the article cited above, the lines:

> And whan this book is maad, yive hit the quene
> On my behalfe, at Eltham, or at Shene,

are in themselves almost conclusive against taking Alceste as the symbol of Queen Anne. We cannot possibly explain the words 'on my behalfe' ('with my compliments') on any theory of an identification. But if Alceste was selected by Chaucer as the Queen of the Court of Love because her virtues were those of Queen Anne, it was eminently fitting that she should bid Chaucer present his work, with the compliments of the Queen of the Court of Love, to the Queen of England. In other words, if we take Alceste as herself and nothing more, as a character in history or fiction, and not as a symbol, but recognise that Chaucer's choice of her as the Queen of the Court of Love was due to the fact that she was a model of the wifely virtues exemplified by Anne, we retain the sound notion that the Prologue was written by Chaucer as a compliment to the queen, and that he made Alceste the vehicle of his compliment, but avoid the difficulties involved in the theory of an allegorical identification.

The fact that Chaucer wrote the *Legend* with the expectation that Queen Anne[2] and (we may assume) King Richard would read it, gives

[1] B 484, 485.

[2] Evidence of the Queen's ability to read English is contained in the following passage printed by John Strype from 'an ancient MS. fragment, writ near three hundred years ago, formerly belonging to the church of Worcester':

Also the Bushop of Caunterbury, Thomas of Arundel, that now is, sey a sermon at Westminster, thereas was many an hundred of people, at the buryeng of Quene Anne, (of whose sowle God have mercy.) And in his commendation of her he seyd, That it was more joy of her, than of any woman, that ever he knew. For notwithstanding that she

a peculiar interest to the passage in the Prologue in which Alceste discourses upon the duties of kings. The interest of this passage does not depend upon our taking the God of Love as a symbol for King Richard, as Bilderbeck would do, for there is no question here of allegory at all[1]. It is simply that, intending that the king and queen should be readers of his poem, Chaucer knew that if Alceste's advice to the God of Love was capable of a personal application, his royal readers might with perfect justice assume that he had foreseen and intended such a personal application. They would credit Chaucer with knowing what he was about, and with being able to see in advance how his (or Alceste's) *Regimen of Princes* would be regarded from the princely point of view. Let us see, therefore, how this passage would look to Richard.

The first part of it, B 342—372, A 318—352, and the last part, B 403—441, A 389—431, deal specifically with the situation between Chaucer and the God of Love. Alceste, in the first part, urges the God to give Chaucer a chance to reply to the accusations made against him; a god should be stable and ready to show mercy; the poet may have been falsely accused by a court tale-bearer; or, if he really did what he is accused of having done, there may be some excuse for his conduct. In the last part of her defence she urges the God, if Chaucer asks mercy, to be appeased; Chaucer has done good work for Love after all; Alceste therefore asks the God of Love not to hurt him, and promises that Chaucer shall offend no more, but make reparation for his offence. In both these parts of her plea she confines herself strictly to the specific case in hand.

Between these two parts, however, is a passage of somewhat different nature, not specific definition of what conduct the God of Love ought to exhibit in this case, but consideration of how kings and lords in general ought to behave on occasions like this one. She says:

> This shulde a rightwys lord han in his thoght,
> And nat be lyk tiraunts of Lumbardye,
> That usen wilfulhed and tirannye,
> For he that king or lord is naturel,
> Him oghte nat be tiraunt ne cruel,
> As is a fermour, to doon the harm he can.

was alien born, [being the daughter of the Emperor Charles IV.] she had on English al the iiij Gospels, with the Doctors upon hem. And he seyd, that she sent them unto him. And he seyd, that they were good and true, and commended her, in that she was so great a lady, and also an alyan, and wolde study so holy, so vertuouse bokes.

(Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, Oxford, 1812, I, p. iii.)

The first edition of this work was published in 1694. For reference to the passage I am indebted to F. A. Gasquet's *Old English Bible*.

[1] Bilderbeck, *Chaucer's Legend of Good Women*, pp. 84—104, 109. For Lowes's refutation of this position see *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, XIX, 674, 675; XX, 773—779. See also Tatlock, p. 120.

He moste thinke hit is his lige man,
*And that him oweth, of verray duetee,
*Shewen his peple pleyn benignitee,
*And wel to here hir excusaciouns,
*And hir compleyntes and peticiouns,
*In duewe tyme, whan they shal hit profre.
This is the sentence of the philosophre:
A king to kepe his liges in Iustyce;
With-outen doute, that is his offyce.
*And thereto is a king ful depe y-sworn,
*Ful many an hundred winter heer-biforn;
And for to kepe his lordes hir degree,
As hit is right and skilful that they be
Enhaunced and honoured, and most dere—
For they ben half-goddes in this world here—
This shal he doon, bothe to pore [and] riche,
Al be that here stat be nat a-liche,
And han of pore folk compassioun.
For lo, the gentil kind of the lioun!
For whan a flye offendeth him or byteth,
He with his tayl awey the flye smyteth
Al esily; for, of his genterye,
Him deyneth nat to wreke him on a flye,
As doth a curre or elles another beste.
In noble corage oghte been areste,
And weyen every thing by equitee,
And ever han reward to his owen degree.
For, sir, hit is no maystrie for a lord
To damne a man with-oute answere or word;
And, for a lord, that is ful foul to use[1].

Now this is excellent advice for the God of Love[2], but it is as good or better advice for Richard, and if he had followed it the whole course of English history in the succeeding century might have been different. And the language of the passage is so general[3] that it applies to all kings, not merely the God of Love. If Richard failed to see its applicability to himself he must have been singularly deficient in self-knowledge; and if Chaucer failed to foresee its applicability to his sovereign he was considerably more naive than we have hitherto supposed him to have been.

SAMUEL MOORE.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

[1] A 353—388. The lines marked with an asterisk are not in B.

[2] See Lowes, *l.c.*, xx, 774 ff., showing that what Alceste says on the duties of kings is not 'dragged in,' as Bilderbeck asserted, but perfectly apposite. We ought to recognise, however, that the matter is certainly over-emphasised, if Chaucer was concerned exclusively with the God of Love and not at all with King Richard. Alceste's speech is nearly one-fifth of the B prologue, and more than a fifth of A. The passage I have quoted is almost a third of the whole speech and (except for rime) could be omitted without causing a perceptible lacuna. Cf. Tatlock, p. 121.

[3] The 'half-goddes' of A 373, indeed, is an indication that Chaucer at this point was thinking more of the general applicability of Alceste's discourse than of its particular reference to the God of Love. For a strict attention to the allegory would have required him to liken the attendant divinities of the God of Love to feudal lords, rather than to liken feudal lords to them.

RICHARDSON'S CHARACTER OF LOVELACE.

Among the most interesting problems in connection with Richardson is that of the origin of the character of Lovelace in the novel of *Clarissa*[1]. It has often been suggested that Lothario in Rowe's tragedy of *The Fair Penitent*[2] is the original of Lovelace. The resemblance however between the two characters has not yet been worked out in detail.

The similarity between the characters of Lothario and Lovelace was first pointed out by Johnson in his life of Rowe[3].

> The character of Lothario seems to have been expanded by Richardson into Lovelace; but he has excelled his original in the moral effect of the fiction. Lothario, with gaiety[4] which cannot be hated, and bravery[4] which cannot be despised, retains too much of the spectator's kindness. It was in the power of Richardson alone to teach us at once esteem and detestation, to make virtuous resentment overpower all the benevolence which wit, elegance, and courage, naturally excite; and to lose at last the hero in the villain.

Austin Dobson is of the same opinion and considers Rowe's Lothario to be a 'much more likely model for Lovelace' than Philip, Duke of Wharton[5].

It is worthy of remark that neither Johnson nor Dobson has quoted a significant passage in Richardson's *Clarissa* in this connection. In this novel Richardson himself has pointed out the resemblance between the characters of Lothario and Lovelace and the lack of resemblance between Calista, the heroine in *The Fair Penitent*, and Clarissa.

Belford wrote to his friend Lovelace on this subject as follows (*Clarissa*, VIII, 24, 25):

> The whole story of the other is a pack of damned stuff. Lothario, 'tis true, seems another wicked ungenerous varlet as thou knowest who: the author knew

[1] *The Novels of Samuel Richardson*, 20 volumes, London, 1902.
[2] *The Fair Penitent* by Nicholas Rowe, edited by S. C. Hart, Boston, 1907.
[3] *Lives of the Most Eminent Poets* (Chandos Edition), London, n.d., p. 216.
[4] Cp. *The Fair Penitent*, v, i, 37:
'Is this that haughty, gallant, gay Lothario?'
[5] *Samuel Richardson* by Austin Dobson, London, 1902, p. 13.

how to draw a rake; but not to paint a penitent. Calista is a desiring luscious wench, and her penitence is nothing but rage, insolence and scorn[1].

Richardson was well acquainted with Rowe's plays which he frequently quoted in his novels, especially in *Clarissa*[2]. In one passage in this novel Richardson refers to the outward resemblance but essential difference between the characters of Calista and Clarissa. This passage is a proof that Richardson had continually Rowe's play in his mind when writing *Clarissa*. Belford wrote to his friend Lovelace on the subject of Clarissa as follows (*Clarissa*, VIII, 24):

> I have frequently thought on my attendance on this lady that, if Belton's admired author, Nic. Rowe, had such a character before him, he would have drawn another sort of penitent than he has done, or given his play which he calls *The Fair Penitent* another title[3]. Miss Harlowe a penitent indeed! I think if I am not guilty of a contradiction in terms, a penitent without a fault, her parents' conduct from the first considered.

A detailed comparison will show that Richardson's statements as to the similarity between Lothario and Lovelace and as to the lack of resemblance between Calista and Clarissa are to be accepted. It may indeed be said that Richardson's Lovelace stands in the same relation to Rowe's Lothario as the latter to its original, young Novall in Massinger and Field's *Fatal Dowry*, the source of *The Fair Penitent*. Lovelace is considered by Johnson to be an improvement on Lothario[4], Lothario surpasses Novall in interest[5]. Here is the place to consider the similarity between Lothario and Lovelace. In their conduct towards Calista and Clarissa Lothario and Lovelace are actuated by revenge. Lothario before the play begins had asked Sciolto, Calista's father, for her hand, but had been refused. Sciolto gave his daughter to Altamont whom he had assisted in much the same way as Charalois in the *Fatal Dowry* was helped by Rochfort. Sciolto's refusal to give him his daughter was the origin of Lothario's desire of revenge.

[1] Johnson was of the same opinion: 'It has been observed, that the title of the play does not sufficiently correspond with the behaviour of Calista, who at last shows no evident signs of repentance, but may reasonably be suspected of feeling pain from detection rather than from guilt, and expresses more shame than sorrow, and more rage than shame,' *Lives of the Poets*, p. 216.

[2] The list in Poetzsche's *Samuel Richardsons Belesenheit* (Kiel, 1908) is not complete. In *Clarissa*, VII, 258 *The Fair Penitent*, v, i, 80—84 is quoted. In *Clarissa*, v, 161, the story of Rowe's being advised by a peer to learn Spanish is told, cp. Johnson, *ib.* p. 218.

[3] Cp. *The Fair Penitent*, London, n.d., Remarks, p. 4.
'The Fair Penitent has justly been pronounced a misnomer. It should have been the Fair Wanton—for there is not a shadow of repentance in any part of Calista's character.'

[4] *Ib.* p. 216.

[5] Cp. Cumberland, *Observer*, No. 78 (London, 1803): 'Rowe has no doubt greatly outstepped his original in the striking character of Lothario, who leaves Novall as far behind him as Charalois does Altamont.'

Lothario told his friend Rossano of his wish to 'gaul' Sciolto and Altamont (*The Fair Penitent*, I, i, 131—135):

> I lik'd her, wou'd have marry'd her,
> But that it pleas'd her father to refuse me,
> To make this honourable fool her husband.
> For which, if I forget him, may the shame
> I mean to brand his name with, stick on mine.

Even at the moment of his death at the hands of Calista's husband Lothario cannot help rejoicing at the success of his plans of revenge (*The Fair Penitent*, IV, i, 115—16):

> That sweet revenge comes smiling to my thoughts,
> Adorns my fall, and chears my heart in dying.

For the same reasons Lovelace wished to revenge himself for his treatment by Clarissa's father and brother. 'Then my revenge on the Harlowes' (*Clarissa*, VII, 333). There is a similar passage in *Clarissa*, III, 112.

A desire to revenge himself on the sex was also a motive in Lovelace's conduct to Clarissa (*Clarissa*, I, 206):

> I have boasted I was once in love before. It was in my early manhood—with that quality jilt, whose infidelity I have vowed to revenge upon as many of the sex as shall come into my power.

Lothario and Lovelace lose their lives in their plans of revenge. Lothario is killed in a duel by Calista's husband, Altamont; Lovelace perishes miserably in the same way at the hands of Clarissa's cousin, Colonel Morden.

Lothario and Lovelace had little inclination to marry. Lothario expressed his views on this subject to Rossano (*The Fair Penitent*, I, 187—195):

> Again she told the same dull nauseous tale.
> Unmov'd I beg'd her spare th' ungrateful subject,
> Since I resolv'd, that love and peace of mind
> Might flourish long inviolate between us,
> Never to load it with the marriage chain;
> That I would still retain her in my heart,
> My ever gentle mistress and my friend;
> But those other names of wife and husband,
> They only meant ill-nature, cares and quarrels.

On this subject Lovelace wrote to his friend Jack Belford (*Clarissa*, VII, 129):

> 'Tis ungentlemanly, Jack, man to man, to lie. But matrimony I do not heartily love—although with a Clarissa—yet I am in earnest to marry her.

Lothario and Lovelace are brave even to rashness and are in no

wise ashamed of their actions. On this point Lothario expressed his views to Altamont's friend Horatio (*The Fair Penitent*, II, ii, 38—41):

> There's not a purpose
> Which my soul ever fram'd, or my hand acted,
> But I could well have bid the world look on,
> And what I once durst do, have dar'd to justifie.

Lovelace was so little ashamed of his actions that he made light of the effect of the reading of Clarissa's letters by his relations although they contained evidence of his behaviour towards her (*Clarissa*, VII, 301):

> What we have been told of the agitations and workings, and sighings and sobbings, of the French prophets formerly, was nothing at all to the scene exhibited by these maudlin souls, at the reading of these letters.

Lothario and Lovelace are both very proud of the importance of their respective families. Lothario in his first conversation with Horatio referred to the greatness of his family in Genoa in no very modest terms (*The Fair Penitent*, II, ii, 28—32):

> Ha! dost thou know me? that I am Lothario?
> As great a name as this proud city boasts of.
> Who is this mighty man then, this Horatio,
> That I should basely hide me from his anger,
> Lest he should chide me for his friend's displeasure?

Lovelace speaks often of the splendour of his family in comparison with Clarissa's.

> Then, what a triumph it would be for the Harlowe pride, were I to marry this lady! a family beneath my own (*Clarissa*, III, 112)[1].

> But was ever hero in Romance (fighting with giants and dragons excepted) called upon to harder trials? Fortune and family, and reversionary grandeur on my side! Such a wretched fellow my competitor (i.e. Roger Solmes)! (*Clarissa*, I, 112.)

The characters of Calista and Clarissa are quite different from one another. Lothario had no great difficulty in gaining the love of Calista. The words exchanged by Lothario and Rossano on this point illustrate Calista's character (*The Fair Penitent*, I, i, 136—139):

> *Rossano.* She, gentle soul, was kinder than her father.
> *Lothario.* She was, and oft in private gave me hearing,
> 'Till by long list'ning to the soothing tale
> At length her easie heart was wholly mine.

Lovelace had in this respect no success. Clarissa had only 'a conditional liking' for him. Richardson, unlike Rowe, had a great objection to the expression of any passionate feelings. In the words

[1] Cf. *Clarissa*, III, 333.

of Johnson placed by him at the head of Richardson's article in the *Rambler* (No. 97), Richardson 'taught the passions to move at the command of virtue.'

Calista complied with the wishes of her father Sciolto and married Altamont. Her point of view she explained to her father when he reproached her with her coldness towards her newly-married husband (*The Fair Penitent*, III, i, 12—15):

> Has not your daughter giv'n herself to Altamont,
> Yielded the native freedom of her will,
> To an imperious husband's lordly rule,
> To gratifie a father's stern command?

Clarissa in spite of threats refused to marry Solmes to please her father, although she was not at all in love with Lovelace. For this reason she was treated badly by her relations who firmly believed she preferred the great enemy of the family, Lovelace. It was not till Clarissa's death that the Harlowe family saw their injustice and mistakes.

It is possible that such men as Philip, Duke of Wharton, or Cibber[1] may have afforded hints for the character of Lovelace. Leigh Hunt thought the name of the hero of *Clarissa* was suggested by the Cavalier poet, Richard Lovelace[2]. Miss Thomson, following Le Breton, *Le Roman au dix-septième Siècle*, suggests the Comte de Grammont as a likely source of Lovelace[3]. The resemblance however between Lothario and Lovelace, pointed out by Richardson and confirmed by comparison, makes it certain that Rowe's character is the chief constituent in the character of the betrayer of Clarissa.

H. G. Ward.

Aachen.

[1] Cf. Leigh Hunt, *The Town* (London, 1859), pp. 91—2.
[2] *Ib.* p. 87.
[3] *Samuel Richardson*, by C. L. Thomson, London, 1900, p. 141.

ON SOME ETYMOLOGIES OF ENGLISH WORDS.

(*Continued from p.* 325.)

MARTINGALE. This word is not a native Provençal word, as S.D.[1] explains, accepting with Littré and Scheler the explanation of Ménage. The genealogy of *martingale* (for holding down a horse's head) is as follows: Fr. *martingale* < Prov. *martingalo, martegalo* < Span. *almartaga* (with the Arab. *al* def. art.) a rein to hold a horse (Stevens), from an Arab. root *rata'a*, cp. Arab. *rata'* 'un pieu auquel on attache une bête,' in common use in Algeria. See Dozy, *Glossaire* (s.v. *Almarṭaga*). For the termination *-ale* (*-alo*) < Lat. *-alis*, compare the *-al* in Fr. *amiral* (E. *admiral*), as explained by Dozy (s.v. *Almirante*), and the *-ale* in *galingale*.

PILLORY. S.D. says, 'Of unknown origin.' One may find in Ducange many examples of the French form *pillorie* under the word 'Pilorium,' dating from the first quarter of the thirteenth century. The word was introduced from the South of France, as may be inferred from the fuller forms of the word found in Provençal, namely *espilori, espitlori*. This latter spelling is crucial, pointing the way to a satisfactory etymology. A Latin type *spectac(u)lorium* 'a place for a spectacle' would be represented in Provençal quite regularly by *espitlori*. By haplology *spectac'lorium* would become *spect'lorium*, the second syllable ending in *c* being lost before the stressed syllable (cp. the words *idolatry, matins, orotund, retable*).

RASCAL. S.D. says, 'Of unknown origin.' It is useful to note that this word was originally used in a collective sense. The old form of the word in English and French was *rascaille*, with the collective French suffix *-aille* (< Lat. neuter pl. *-alia*), appearing in *canaille, valetaille, prêtraille*, etc. In Old French the word *rascaille* had the meaning of scum, dregs, offal, rubbish, which appears to be the original

[1] Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, ed. 4, 1910.

meaning; whence was derived the figurative sense, a rabble or mob, especially the rabble of an army, camp-followers and the like. Both these uses of the word *rascaille* are found in English. The word in slightly differing forms appears with both meanings in the Promptorium: '*Rascaly* or refuce qwere so hit be—*caducum*'; and '*Rascayle* or simple peple—*infimas*' (Winch. MS. p. 366). Cotgrave gives the primary, as well as the secondary, meaning: '*Racaille* (1) the scum, dregs, and (2) the rascality or base and rascall sort,...the outcasts of any company.' What is the etymology of O.F. *rascaille* dregs? I think that it is connected with the Provençal *raca* 'marc de raisin' (Lévy); cp. mod. Prov. *raco* 'marc de vendange' (see Glossary to Mistral's *Mirèio*). This word has lost an initial dental, as we may infer from the mod. Prov. forms *draco, dracho, traco, treco*. The mod. Prov. *draco* answers to O.F. *drache* husks of grapes, *dracque* in Palsgrave, and Anglo-Norm. *draque* (Moisy). This French form *draque* has left a trace in the dialect of Devon in the word *drakes* a slop, a mess (E.D.D.). The loss of the initial *d* in the Provençal forms is paralleled in the O.F. forms *rancle, raöncle* for older *drancle, draöncle*; see S.D. (s.v. *Rankle*). It is probable that O.F. *drache* (with the cognate forms) is of Teutonic origin, as is suggested by Oskar Hennicke in his Glossary to Mistral's *Mirèio*. An older form of the O.F. *drache* is found in *drasche* 'cosse de légume' which can be referred to a Teutonic type *drastjōn*, whence O.E. *dærstan*, dregs, lees, and *drestés* (in Palsgrave), see N.E.D. (s.v. *Drast*). See Mackel, *Germ. Elemente* (1887), 158, and S.D. (s.v. *Rack* 4).

Scotch, to cut with narrow incisions. S.D. says, 'It seems to be an extension from *scoren*, to score, affected by the verb *scorch*, to flay.' This can hardly be deemed a satisfactory explanation. The earliest quotation given by N.E.D. is from Hoccleve (c. 1412), in which a face is said to be '*scocched*' with knives. N.E.D. does not venture on an etymology.

The word *scotch* to make an incision, to gash is doubtless identical with Ang.-Nor. *escocher* 'entamer la peau' (Moisy). This word is a derivative of Fr. *coche* 'a nock, notch, the nut-hole of a cross-bow' (Cotgrave). Compare Ital. *cocca* 'the nut of a cross-bow, the nock of an arrow, also, a dent of anything' (Florio); hence, *coccare* 'far entrar la corda dell' arco, nella cocca; *Accoccare*' (Fanfani).

Tike. It is generally agreed that the word 'tike,' a term in frequent use in the north country for a dog or cur, is identical with the Scandinavian *tīk* a bitch. E.D.D. shows that 'tike' is widely used

in the north metaphorically for a rough, ill-mannered, churlish fellow. E.D.D. and S.D. tell us that this use of the word is found in Piers Plowman (B. xix, 37), a text written in the west midland dialect:

> As wyde as the worlde is wonyth there none
> But under tribut and taillage as *tykes* and cherles.

It would appear from the context that the word 'tykes' in this passage is not used in a metaphorical or contemptuous sense. The description 'tykes and cherles' has a political value, denoting a definite social class subject to 'tribut and taillage.' The west midland political class-name must be kept quite distinct from the northern synonym for a cur. I would suggest that it may be identical with a word of frequent occurrence in the Ancient Laws of Wales in the sense of a villein or churl, namely *taiawc* (mod. Welsh *taiog*). See Glossary and Index to *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales.* The word literally means a householder; Old Celtic *tegâcos* householder, deriv. of *tegos* (Welsh *ty*) house. Compare Cornish *tîak* (*tioc*) a farmer, Williams' Dict. (1865). 'Tyacke' is not an uncommon Cornish surname.

Topaz. S.D. suggests connexion with Skr. *tapas* fire, but does not support the conjecture with any argument. The Gr. τόπαζος (also τόπαζον, τοπάζιον) the yellow topaz is probably of Semitic origin. It probably came into the Greek language through the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. In the Septuagint (Ps. cxviii, 127) τοπάζιον occurs as a rendering of the Hebrew word *pâz* ('fine gold,' A.V.). Schleusner suggests that the reading should be τὸ πάζιον. In Ps. xviii, 11 the Hebrew *pâz* is rendered λίθος τίμιος (a precious stone). This seems to corroborate the derivation of '*topaz*' the name of the yellow precious stone from *pâz* the Hebrew word for fine gold—the Greek definite article having become a part of the word.

II. *Objections to Etymologies in S.D., mainly on phonetic grounds, without the suggestion of alternative derivations.*

Hackney. S.D. identifies this name for a horse with *Hackney* the name of the village north of London. This explanation leaves out of consideration the fact that the word in numberless forms is in common use all over West Europe, and is widely spread along the shores of the Mediterranean. A comparison of these forms will, I think, show conclusively that the word does not owe its origin to the name of an English village. There is not the slightest historical evidence

that the term was originally applied specially to English horses. Here are some of the continental forms of the word: O.F. *haquenée* 'an ambling horse or mare, especially for ladies to ride on'; Sp. *hacanea*; Ital. *acchinéa*, also *chinea* (Florio); O. Prov. *haqueneia, acanea, facaneia*; O. Sp. and Port. *facanea*. From the French word was adopted at an early period Dutch *hackeneie*. With these Romanic words we may associate the shortened forms O.F. *haque*, O. Prov. *haca, faca*, O. Sp. *faca*—all used in the sense of 'nag, gelding.' It is to be noted that the oldest forms of the word in the Mediterranean countries have *f-* initial not *h-*; this seems to point to a foreign, probably to an Arabic origin. In Ducange I find '*Haque, Equus Haque* "Semiexsectus, à moitié coupé," ann. 1457.' The most common meaning of the word seems to have been 'a gelding.'

Jury-mast. S.D. says '*jury* perhaps short for **ajúry* < O.F. *ajuirie* aid (Godefroy).' Alas! this is a conjecture unsupported by any historical evidence. S.D. adds, 'Cf. *iuwere* "remedium" Prompt. Parv.' This does not help much, as '*iuwere*' = med. Lat. *iuweria* (the office of judge); see Ducange (s.v. *juveria*), and '*remedium*' means 'Remedium legis, Appellatio a sententia judicis inferioris ad superiorem' (Duc.). See Promptorium (Winch. MS. E.E.T.S., 1908, note no. 1132).

Mound. The oldest meaning of this word according to the evidence in N.E.D. was 'a hedge or other fence bounding a field or garden.' This meaning is now current only in Oxfordshire and the counties near its border (see E.D.D.). This makes rather doubtful the equation of *mound* with Anglo-Fr. *mund* (*munt*) a hill. Any 'confusion' of *mound* with O.E. *mund* is not to be thought of. The ordinary use of O.E. *mund* was as a technical legal term in the sense of protection, guardianship extended by the king to the subject, by the head of a family to its members. This word seems to have become obsolete early in the thirteenth century; the last quotation for it given in N.E.D. is from Layamon (ann. 1205). But the earliest quotation in N.E.D. for *mound* (a hedge) is from Crowley (ann. 1551).

Pawn, a pledge. S.D. says '*pawn* < Fr. *pan* a pane; a pawn or gage.' The regular phonetic equivalent of Fr. *pan* 'a pane, skirt' in English is *pane*. The pronunciation *pawn* points to an O.F. *an* + dental, and so to the O.F. *pand, pant* (*pan* in Cotgrave) pledge, security, surety, also booty. For the phonology compare E. *spawn* vb. < O.F. *espandre* to shed, scatter. S.D. wavers between two contradictory opinions about the etymology of the French word *pan* (*pand, pant*) a pledge. At first,

it is said to be of Teutonic origin, and in the last paragraph 'all the forms [Teutonic and Romanic] may be ultimately referred to L. *pannus*.' I believe that O.F. *pand* is neither of Teutonic origin, nor derived from *pannus*. The E. pronunciation is against the latter hypothesis, as also the final dental of the O.F. *pand*. The initial *p* (*ph*, *pf*) in the Teutonic forms points to a non-Germanic origin. We cannot get beyond the med. Lat. form *pandum* in Ducange.

POUR, to emit in a stream. S.D. identifies this word with O.F. *purer*. But there are difficulties in this equation, difficulties semantic and phonetic. The verb 'pour' from its earliest appearance in English literature in the fourteenth century to the present day has always had the same meaning 'to cause or allow a liquid or granular substance to flow out of a vessel or receptacle' (N.E.D.). The essential and radical meaning of the French verb *purer* is very different. 'O.F. *purer* "presser des légumes pour en faire sortir le jus ou la pulpe,"'—this is the definition given in Hatzfeld and Darmesteter, and this is the meaning that the verb has in the Norman dialects, as may be seen from the quotations in S.D. O.F. *purer* appears to be the same word as the Lat. *pūrūre* found in *sup-pūrāre* to suppurate, a derivative of *pūs*, and cognate of *pūrulentus*, cp. Gr. *πύω* and *πῦον*.

Discussing the etymology E. *pour* < Fr. *purer* N.E.D. says, 'The phonology presents difficulty. It is doubtful whether English has any certain instance of *ou* from Fr. *u* < Lat. *ū*.' The case of E. *scour* (to cleanse by rubbing) < Latin type *excūrare* (O.F. *escurer*) is not analogous. Probably 'scour' was adopted by us as a technical term introduced by Flemish workmen, cp. Dutch *schuren* (see N.E.D.), and so came to us through a Germanic medium.

RUMMAGE. This word meant primarily the arranging of casks, etc., in the hold of a vessel. It is comparatively a modern word in English. N.E.D. has no quotations earlier than the sixteenth century. It originated in the wine trade carried on in Spain, Portugal and the South of France. S.D. appears to hold that the word was manufactured in England, and simply stands for 'roomage.' N.E.D. gives the right explanation. *Rummage* is an aphetic adoption of older Fr. *arrumage* (also Sp.) from *arrumer* (mod. *arrimer*), = Sp. and Port. *arrumar*, Prov. *arumar*. The etymology of this Mediterranean trade word is doubtful. Prof. Weekley has given a full discussion of the various theories in his paper on *Anglo-French Etymologies* (1909), p. 27. The primary meaning of the verb seems to have been 'to arrange.'

SARACEN. S.D. still explains 'Saracen' as meaning literally 'one of the *eastern* people,' deriving the word from the Arab. *sharq* east, the quarter of the rising sun. But S.D. refers us to the well-known note in Gibbon, ch. 50, so that this etymology is not looked upon as quite certain. Surely the last and most popular of the etymologies of 'Saracen' should be rejected as impossible. As Gibbon observes, 'it is refuted by Ptolemy who expressly remarks the *western* position of the Saracens, then an obscure tribe on the borders of Egypt.' From this 'obscure tribe' was derived the general appellation of Saracens for the Arabian tribes extending from Mecca to the Euphrates. The original meaning of the name of this 'obscure tribe' must remain obscure. Probably it is not of Arabic origin. At any rate the geographical position of the tribe with regard to the other Arabs is against the hypothesis of a derivation from an Arabic word meaning 'Oriental.'

III. *Criticisms on phonetic details in S.D.*

BUREAU. O.F. *buire* does not represent Lat. *bŭrrus*, as S.D. says, but a Late Lat. type *būrius*, which is also seen in Ital. *buio*, see Diez, p. 74. The cognates in the various Romanic languages have *u* constant in the radical syllable, which points to a Lat. *ū* (see N.E.D. s.v. *Bureau*). Consequently, the Chaucer word *borel* (*burel*) in '*borel* men' (C.T. B. 3145) and '*burel* folk' (C.T. D. 1872) must be kept apart from *bureau*.

DESPATCH, to send off with expedition, Span. *despachar*. Compare Prov. *despachar* 'finir son affaire' (Lévy). The Latin type would be **dispactare*, from the Lat. pp. *pactus* 'fixed, fastened,' so that **dispactare* would mean to *unfix*, to set free. The synonymous Ital. *dispacciare* (*spacciare*) is from a Latin type **dispactiare*. Compare the southern forms given under 'Impeach' (see below).

IMPEACH. Under this word S.D. places together various words and forms in the Romanic languages which have the meaning of impeding, hindering. This notion is expressed in the northern and southern languages by similar words of two radically distinct origins. E. *impeach* < O.F. *empescher* represents Lat. *impedicare* to hinder, from *pedica* a fetter. Prov. and Span. *empachar* represent a Latin type *impactare* to hold fast, to hinder, from Lat. pp. *pactus* fixed, fastened. Ital. *impacciare* to hinder, represents a Latin type *impactiare* (not *impacticare*, as stated in S.D.).

It may be noted that the southern form Prov. *empedegar* is a learned form of Lat. *impedicare*, as may be seen from the retention of the pretonic vowel.

JADE, a kind of green stone. This word means lit. 'the colic (stone),' being ultimately derived from a Lat. type *iliata*, deriv. of Lat. *ilia* the flanks. The steps between the form *jade* and *iliata* are: Fr. *jade, le jade* < *l'éjade* (ann. 1633) < Span. *ijada*, in *piedra de ijada* (ann. 1569), < Lat. *iliata*. Cp. Span. *mal de Ijada* 'the Chollick, a Pain in the Flank' (Stevens). For the disappearance of Lat. *l* before *i*, cp. Lat. *filium, folia* > Sp. *hijo, hoja*.

JADE, a contemptuous name for a horse. There is no doubt that *jade* is the same word as the Scottish *yaud* with the same meaning. They can both be derived from the same Old Norse word, the Icel. *yalda* a mare. *Yalda* would give **jaude* in Norm.-French, whence E. *jade* quite regularly; cp. *safe* < Fr. *sauf* < Lat. *salvum* and *sage* < O.F. *sauge* < Lat. *salvia*. The Sc. *yaud* is derived directly from the Norse, while E. *jade* comes to us through a French dialect.

ORANGE. S.D. derives the O.F. *orenge* immediately from the Ital. *arancia* (Florio). The fruit and its name came into northern France immediately from the south—from Provence and Languedoc. O.F. *orenge* is derived directly from Prov. *auranja* with the usual change *au* > *o*. The *aur-* in Prov. *auranja* is due to *aur* gold, from the golden colour of the fruit, and takes the place of an earlier *n)aranja*, cp. Span. *naranja* < Arab. *nâranj* < Pers. *nârang*. From a distinct Latin type **n)arantia* we get the Ital. forms *narancia* (*arancia*) in Florio, and *rancia* (Dante, *Purg.* II, 9); cp. Med. Lat. *pomerancia* [*pomum* + *arantia*], whence Ger. *Pomeranze* orange, and Mod. Gr. *νεράντζι* (see Triandaphyllidis *Lehnwörter*, 1909, p. 132).

PAPER. Fr. *papier* is not the phonetic equivalent of Lat. *papȳrum* (*papīrum*); the *-ier* shows change of suffix (*-ĕrum*). There is also a Romanic type *papērum* which is vouched for by Welsh and Italian forms. Rom. **papērum* will account for Welsh *pabwyr* the wick of a lamp or candle, for which a reed was formerly used; and for Ital. *papéro* a gunner's match (Florio), also *papejo* the wick of a candle (Fanfani).

PARTISAN, one who takes part. Fr. *partisan* is not derived directly from the Tuscan form *partigiano*, but from one of the Italian dialect forms which retain the original *s*, cp. Roman and Neapol. *partisano*,

Upper Italian *partezan* (see N.E.D.). The sound *gi* is a Tuscan development of the Latin *si*, cp. the place-names *Perugia* < *Perusia*, *Parigi* < *Parisii*.

PLEACH—PLASH. S.D. does not explain how these two forms are connected with one another, and how they can both be derived from one Latin type **plectiare*. The difference in form is due to the fact that *pleach* and *plash* came to us from different French dialects—*plash* from Central French, and *pleach* from the Picard dialect: (1) E. *plash* (dial. *plesh*) < O.F. *plaissier*, *plessier* (to plait, interweave, twine) represents a Latin type **plectiare*, deriv. of Lat. *plectere*, cp. O.F. *plaisse*, *plesse* a hedge, whence med. Lat. *plessa* 'virgulta implexa' (Duc.). (2) E. *pleach* represents O.F. (northern) *plechier* (mod. F. *plécher*). 'Plash' is much the older form in English. The Centr. Fr. form *plaissier* occurs in Anglo-Norman in Wace's poems—*Rom. de Brut* and *Rom. de Rou*. See Moisy (s.v. *Plesser*).

RAISIN. S.D. explains 'Fr. *raisin* < Folk Latin *racīmum*.' Surely the Romanic (or Folk Latin) form was *raceṃum* < Lat. *racēmum*. Compare *plaisir* < Rom. *placere*; *loisir* < *licere*; *cire* < *cera*.

SEWER, one who sets dishes on the table. This is an aphetic form of *assewer* with the same meaning (see N.E.D.) < Anglo.-Fr. *assëour* (Godefroy) < Late Lat. *assedatorem* 'qui fait asseoir,' a derivative of Lat. *sedare* to cause to sit.

SHERRY. S.D. says '(Span.-L.).' It should be '(Span.-Arab.-L.).' The old form *sherris* is due to *Xeres* the Spanish name of the famous town near Cadiz, of which the Arabic form was *sherêysh*. See Dozy, *Glossaire*, p. 18. The Roman name for this Xeres was *Caesaris Asidona*. By the loss of the first syllable *Caesaris* became on the lips of the Moors *sherêysh*[1]. Lat. *s* is regularly represented by Arab. *sh* (whence the Span. *x*), compare Arab. *shatriya*, Span. *axedrea*, both derived from Lat. *satureia* (Dozy, p. 219). It should be noted that the Roman names *Caesar*, *Cesarea* are transliterated in Arabic with initial *q* (not *sh*), e.g. *qaiṣar*, *qaiṣâriyya*. Compare Lat. *castra* whence Arab. *qaṣr* 'castle,' and Span. *alcazar* 'citadel' (Dozy, p. 90).

SKATES. S.D. does not give a very clear account of the phonetic relations between this word and its continental cognates. The English

[1] For a similar decapitation of the word *Caesar*, compare the name of the Spanish city *Zaragoça* < *Caesar Augusta*.

form *skates*, although understood by us as a plural, is identical with Dutch *schaats* 'a skate,' the equivalent of O.F. (Picard) *escache* (in pl. *escaches* stilts). In Jersey and Guernsey *écaches* is the patois word for stilts. Derived directly from the Picard form *escache* is the E. *scatch* 'a stilt,' occurring in Levin's *Manipulus* (N.E.D.), now obsolete, except in dialects (see E.D.D. s.v. *Sketch*). The mod. Fr. *échasse* 'stilt' is due to O.F. *eschace*, *escace*, the central French pronunciation of the Picard *escache*. For the phonology we may compare Du. *schaats* < Pic. *escache* (E. *scatch*) = Cent. Fr. *escace* (mod. Fr. *échasse*) with Du. *Kaats* ('chase') < Pic. *cachier* (E. *catch*) = Cent. Fr. *chacier* (mod. Fr. *chasser*, E. *chase*). To sum up, *skates* = Dutch *schaats* 'a skate' < Pic. *escache*, and *scatch* (*sketch*) = Pic. *escache*. The French word is, as S.D. shows, of Germanic origin.

Stubble. S.D. says that 'Late Lat. *stupula* is a variant of Lat. *stipula* due to the influence of Low G. *stoppel* stubble (Lübben).' This is putting the cart before the horse with a vengeance. O.H.G. *stupfila*, M.H.G. *stupfel* (stubble) are due to Lat. *stupula* (*stupla*), and Lübben's word *stoppel* is a comparatively late Low German form of the same Latin word. The change *u* < *i* in late Latin is noted in Rönsch, *Itala* (1875), p. 465, and did not require any Teutonic influence; it is met with in Petronius. It may be noted that there are equivalents of Lat. *stup(u)la* both in the north and south of France—cp. Norman-Fr. *estoble*, *estuble* (Moisy), and Prov. *estobla* (Lévy).

Tally. S.D. explains the *-y* as due to the French pp. suffix *-é* (< Lat. *-ata*). The Anglo-Fr. form is *taillie* (a tally), due to an Anglo-Lat. *talia* (*tallia*); cp. Lat. *talea* a stick cut with transverse notches. Hence Fr. *tailler* to cut, of which *taille* a notch is a verbal substantive.

A. L. Mayhew.

Oxford.

SHELLEY'S 'WITCH OF ATLAS.'

In August of the year 1820 Shelley started from the Baths of St Julian under the Pisan hills for a short tour to the summit of Monte San Pellegrino. In a deep trance of inspiration following his return home he wrote the 670 lines of *The Witch of Atlas* in three days. The fable of the Witch may be divided into three parts or chapters. The first (I—XX) tells how a Nymph bore her to the Sun in a cave of Mount Atlas, and of the strange treasures of her dwelling, and how all the demons and creatures of earth were attracted to her, and how she tempered her beauty to mortal eyes by a veil of cloud and light. The second part (XXI—XLVI) tells how the Lady might not accept the companionship of the earthly creatures, and how she created a being to be her companion. At first she lived alone in her cave, sending out her thoughts through all the Universe; for when the beings of earth desired to live with her, she refused them, saying that there could be no equal love between mortal and immortal. When they had left her she wept in her solitude. Then she tempered fire and snow together in the medium of Love, and made from them a shape of great beauty, a Hermaphrodite with no defect of either sex and with all the grace of both. She loved to drift with the Hermaphrodite down mountain streams in a magic boat, the gift of Apollo her father, wherein the Hermaphrodite would lie dreaming the while; and if she wished to speed up stream, she waked him, and he would oar the boat with his pinions to the mountain springs. In the third part (XLVII—LXXVIII) we read of the many pranks of the Witch. She would fare to the Antarctic Ocean and live there in a misty tent, where her ministers would bring news of mankind, at which she would grow pale, or laugh, or cry. She sported in the clouds and winds, and there were halcyon days for men when she came near the earth. Or she would pass by night among the cities on the Nile to watch the slumberers, rejoicing in the sight of fair and happy life, and not dismayed by the sight of evil, for her spirit could plunge at any time to the deeps of calm beneath the welter of things. Seeing into men's hearts she would

cause the spirits of the good to mingle with her own, or give them panaceas, or turn their deaths into dreamy trances. In the slaves of Custom she would raise dreams that mocked the purposes of their lives, and bring together bashful lovers and estranged friends. Such were the tricks she played, and thereby she did not feel that longing for a reciprocal love by which in after days her soul is said to have been vexed (LXVIII).

Thrown off to all appearance as a toy of the fancy, or as it were for a marginal design to some greater work, the verses are all instinct with the attar of Shelley's poetry. Nowhere else does he more remind us of those primordial Spirits who shouted for joy at the wonders of Creation, and who would range, not the haunts of men, but the firmament, the storm-clouds and mists, the seas and mountain steeps. Nor does he play so long and so exquisitely in any other poem with his peculiar gift for the making of a myth or a fairy tale. Shelley always exercises this gift in a grave and tender mood, as in the *Prometheus*, for instance when he sends out the Spirit of the Earth to spy upon men, or in the story of Cythna in her sea-cave; but here the gravity and tenderness are shot through with that playful comedy which is the dominant colour of his work in these summer months of 1820, at its best in the *Letter to Maria Gisborne* and at its poorest in *Swellfoot the Tyrant*. It is not altogether a small point that this poem contains his first touch of what may be called the sportive grotesque. According to Ruskin, (*Stones of Venice* III, iii) the essence of grotesque is to hold in check the terror of evil so as to play with it. The definition might be made to cover every artistic presentation of terrible things; and in this wider sense the rotting garden in *The Sensitive Plant* (March, 1820) has more than a little of the gift which Browning has used in his *Childe Roland*. But to be both earnest and merry in presence of the evil or the hideous was a gain in the power of comedy (and that is in the power of life) which had been long in coming. In the summer of 1816 Shelley had rushed out of a company of friends in intense horror at the vision of 'a woman with eyes in her breasts' looking at him from over the balustrade of a staircase; and in the fair copy of *The Witch* at the Bodleian Library the sudden unsteadiness of the handwriting after the rejected line about 'monophthalmic Polyphemes' tells a like tale[1]. But the words are replaced in the text by the still stronger line of the

lumps neither alive nor dead,
Dog-headed, bosom-eyed, and bird-footed (135, 136).

[1] Medwin, I 257. On the unsteady writing in the fair copy see Mr Locock's *Examination of the Shelley Manuscripts in the Bodleian*, p. 18.

Indeed, throughout his Italian period the sense of new powers germinating and still to ripen, while it heartened Shelley against the cold of popular criticism, kept him at the same time drifting in poetry from one experiment to another. Like *The Witch of Atlas*, *Swellfoot the Tyrant*, *Epipsychidion* and *Adonais* were all struck off quickly on chance-flung motives, and the one work at which he thought and laboured persistently—the drama of *Charles the First*—would not come right. He was trying his powers; sometimes with a doubt whether he might not be wasting them in the process, whether, as he wrote to Medwin (July 20, 1820), 'the attempt to excel in many ways does not debar from excellence in one particular kind[1],' but always trusting again in his future. *The Witch*, as he protests to Mary in the opening verses, is a promissory work; the kitten may be suffered to play 'till its claws come.' It may be, as Professor Woodberry supposes[2], that had he lived he would have created a religious drama in the style of Calderon. Perhaps it is a nearer guess, bearing in mind *The Triumph of Life*, that his chief master would have been Dante rather, and his finest medium the allegorical vision, tinged with grotesque and not a little with satire. To this kind *The Witch of Atlas*, *The Mask of Anarchy* and the great fragment of 1822 belong together, though the first is marked off from the other two by special differences. For *The Witch of Atlas* is an allegory; but one so cunningly framed that there is but a delicate translucence of the inner truth, and no more than a faint suffusion of sorrow in what is else the most clear-hearted of Shelley's songs.

And in this also, in the infusion of a philosophic import, the poem is characteristic. It was Shelley's way to be pre-occupied with truth and to dress it in his art in the shows of life; whereas the other kind of poet sees truth only as embedded in things, and perhaps without disengaging it at all. Yet with this conceptual frame of mind Shelley could never complain, as Schiller used to do, of being deficient in phantasy, such is the crowd of images from books and from life swept together into this poem by the wind of inspiration. The germ of his idea lay, perhaps, in the stanzas of the *Faerie Queene* which tell of the wanton Phædria in her 'litle gondelay' on the Idle Lake (II, vi 3).

> And therein sate a Ladie fresh and fayre
> Making sweet solace to her selfe alone:
> Sometimes she song as lowd as larke in ayre
> Sometimes she laught that nigh her breth was gone:

[1] Cf. what he said to Trelawny of the *Cenci* being an experiment, and of the advisability of 'keeping to one style,' *Records*, ch. ix.

[2] See the Introduction to his edition of selected poems.

> Yet was there not with her else any one,
> That might to her move cause of meriment:
> Matter of merth enough, though there were none,
> She could devise, and thousand waies invent
> To feede her foolish humour and vaine jolliment;

(cf. especially *W. A.* XXI); and she laughs to see the pinnace cleave the waters, like Shelley's Witch amid the fire-balls of the air. Purified of all evil, the Lady of the Boat becomes, like Urania in the *Adonais*, 'the better genius of the world's estate.' Like Spenser's Belphœbe and Amoretta, again, she is conceived miraculously by a Nymph of the rays of the Sun[1]. Like Urania, or like the Spirit of the Earth in *Prometheus Unbound* (III, iv 33 f.), who also could lurk at the bottom of a fountain, she walked among men 'while they slept and she unseen' (*P. U.* III, iv 50), noting them with joy or pain. In July 1820 Shelley turned the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes* into English in the same easy lilt of the *ottava rima* in which a month later he sang of the Witch; and throughout the *fantasia* there is a sort of afterglow from that old and happy tale. The Nymph Maia bears her son to Zeus in a cave

> μακάρων δὲ θεῶν ἠλεύαθ' ὅμιλον,
> ἄντρον ἔσω ναίουσα παλίσκιον, ἔνθα Κρονίων
> νύμφῃ ἐϋπλοκάμῳ μισγέσκετο νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ.

('She shunned the assembly of the blessed Gods, dwelling within a shadowy cave, where the Son of Kronos was wont to embrace the fair-tressed Nymph in the deep of night'—Mr Andrew Lang's Translation.) There are 'tripods' in the cave and 'store of cauldrons' (ll. 60, 61; cf. *W. A.* XX), and when Apollo enters the dwelling,

> παπτήνας δ' ἄρα πάντα μυχὸν μεγάλοιο δόμοιο
> τρεῖς ἀδύτους ἀνέῳγε λαβὼν κληῖδα φαεινὴν
> νέκταρος ἐμπλείους ἠδ' ἀμβροσίης ἐρατεινῆς·
> πολλὸς δὲ χρυσός τε καὶ ἄργυρος ἔνδον ἔκειτο,
> πολλὰ δὲ φοινικόεντα καὶ ἄργυφα εἵματα νύμφης,
> οἷα θεῶν μακάρων ἱεροὶ δόμοι ἐντὸς ἔχουσιν. (246—251)

('Gazing round all the chamber of the vasty dwelling, he opened three aumbries with the shiny key; full were they of nectar and glad ambrosia, and much gold and silver lay within, and much raiment of the Nymph, purple and glistering, such as are within the dwellings of the mighty gods')[2]. And so the Atlas Nymph is begotten in the

[1] The parallel has been remarked by T. Böhme in *Spenser's Einfluss auf Shelley*, Berlin Dissertation, 1909.

[2] These are not the only touches from the Hymn. The ll. 43—46:—'And as a swift thought wings through the breast of one whom crowding cares are haunting...so swiftly devised Hermes both deed and word'—are magically echoed in *W. A.* 319 (cf. the *Hymn*

cave, and lives there apart from the other Gods; and so (for her as elsewhere in Shelley the Greek myth suffers a change and 'puts on incorruption') the nectar and gold of Maia are converted into visions, thought-stirring odours, and death-defeating elixirs (*W. A.* xv f.). Mr Locock in his recent edition of the poems has pointed out that the woodland deities who attend the Lady are suggested by the description of these beings gathering around Una in the *Faerie Queene* (I, vi 7 ff.), who

> [In] wonder of her beautie soverayne
> Are wonne with pitty and unwonted ruth[1].

There is again an echo of the Homeric Hymns in the incident of the animals that join her train. In the *Hymn to Aphrodite* the Goddess comes to Ida attended by the beasts which she controls by her power:—

> οἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτὴν
> σαίνοντες πολιοί τε λύκοι χαροποί τε λέοντες,
> ἄρκτοι, παρδάλιές τε θοαὶ προκάδων ἀκόρητοι
> ἦισαν· ἡ δ' ὁρόωσα μετὰ φρεσὶ τέρπετο θυμὸν,
> καὶ τοῖς ἐν στήθεσσι βάλ' ἵμερον. (69—73; cf. *W. A.* VI f.)

('Behind her came fawning the beasts, grey wolves, and lions fiery-eyed, and bears, and swift pards, insatiate pursuers of the roe-deer. Glad was she at the sight of them, and sent desire into their breasts.') Aphrodite also has 'glistering garments' *εἵματα σιγαλόεντα*, 85 f.,

> κάλλος δὲ παρειάων ἀπέλαμπεν
> ἄμβροτον, οἷόν τ' ἐστὶν ἐϋστεφάνου Κυθερείης.
> (174, 175; cf. *W. A.* XII f.)

('From her cheeks shined forth immortal beauty.') The pictures of the fabulous Egypt may be a garnished version of some passages in the second book of Herodotus, where much is said of Mœris and the Labyrinth and King Amasis. The picture of boys riding tame crocodiles had long been familiar to Shelley in Landor's *Gebir* (IV, 165, 166):—

> Crowned were tame crocodiles, and boys white-robed
> Guided their creaking crests across the stream;

to the Pythian Apollo 8, 9). And, by the bye, who that has studied Shelley's way with Greek poetry of beating out and enamelling its phrases will refuse to see in ll. 97, 98,

> ὀρφναίη δ' ἐπίκουρος ἐπαύετο δαιμονίη νύξ,
> ἠ πλείων, τάχα δ' ὄρθρος ἐγίγνετο δημιοεργός

('Then stayed for the more part his darkling ally, the sacred Night, and swiftly came morning when men can work'), the germ of the verses in *The Boat on the Serchio* and *The Triumph of Life*, in which the dawn calls men to labour? Dowden has suggested that the frolic tone in *The Witch* was due to Shelley's recent perusal of the burlesque epic *Ricciardetto* by the Italian poet Fortiguerra. The Homeric Hymns will account for the tone, and there is nothing else in Fortiguerra to remind us of *The Witch*, unless it be that in *Ricciardetto* ix 83, a witch can turn into a frog and live at the bottom of a well, and in xxv 35 f., another sorceress summons all kinds of savage beasts and monsters around her.

[1] The coincidence is also noticed by Böhme, *op. cit.*

and he may have remembered the juggler on the crocodile in the Towneley marbles of the British Museum[1]. In the *Faerie Queene* the priests of Isis, all dressed alike in 'linnen robes with silver hemd' and moon-shaped mitres, sleep on the earth round the image of their deity (v, vii 4 ff.; cf. *W. A.* LXIV). Perhaps, too, memories of life mingled with these others from books. As a boy at Eton, Shelley would have seen in Dr Lind's study 'a curious book representing every part of a Chinese monastery, buildings, utensils, gods, priests, and idols; very neatly and most elaborately executed, and the colours uncommonly vivid' (Account of a visit to Dr Lind in Miss Burney's *Diary*, ed. Austen Dobson, II, 339). May it not be that, if there was a dormitory in the book, the rows of Chinese faces, all alike (*W. A.* LXIV), made a fast impression on him? As to the Antarctic scenery[2], I would hazard a guess that at some time or other Shelley went skating on an Alpine lake, and drew his imagery from that experience. 'I daresay,' he writes to Medwin from Florence in January 1820, 'the lake before you is a plain of solid ice, bounded by the snowy hills, whose white mantles contrast with the aerial rose-colour of the eternal glaciers—a scene more grand, yet like the recesses of the Antarctic circle. If your health allows you to skate, this plain is the floor of your Paradise, and the white world seems spinning backwards as you fly.' Gather these memories together, and you have most of the incident of the poem. The main theme, however, the heart-sorrow of the lonely Nymph, who, being immortal, cannot exchange love with mortal creatures, is taken once more from the Homeric Hymns. The bitter drop in the cup of Aphrodite, when she loves Anchises, is the thought that his beauty must pass away, and therewith her love. 'If, being such as thou art in beauty and form, thou couldst live on, and be called my lord, then this grief would not overshadow my heart. But it may not be, for swiftly will pitiless old age come upon thee....Deep and sore hath been my folly, and distraught have

[1] The image was present to his mind in *The Mask of Anarchy*, where

> Like Sidmouth, next, Hypocrisy
> On a crocodile rode by. (Stanza ix.)

[2] At the risk of falling into the obvious temptation in this kind of study I would suggest that Shelley may also have been thinking of Lewis's Oriental tale *Amorassan, or The Spirit of the Frozen Ocean*. Two aspects of the story come into account: (*a*) The Spirits of the Just and Pure live in an aerial pavilion on Mount Caucasus, and the walls of the pavilion are hung with pictures representing the progress of all good and evil deeds on earth, at sight of which the spirits now rejoice and now mourn; cf. *W. A.* LII f. (*b*) The Spirit of the Frozen Ocean has the power of seeing the motives of men, and when called upon reveals them with pitiless truth. She is a female spirit of great but cold beauty, who lives in some indefinite Arctic island. In the tale she appears at the Court of an Eastern Potentate, after a false sentence has been pronounced, and indicates the real criminal.

I been who carry a child beneath my girdle, the child of a mortal man' (*Hymn to Aphrodite*, 241 f.). Thus the visions came homing to Shelley's call; but he called them to shadow forth a law of life, a truth that he held, not only in terms of desire and pain, but in intellectual terms as well.

The truth is so wrapped up in its images that some critics refuse to see it at all. 'It seems to me,' says Mr Clutton-Brock, 'one of those poems in which Shelley wrote about all the things that pleased him most, and of which the subject was a mere pretext for doing so.' It is hardly surprising that most readers, from Mary onwards, have found here 'a lack of human interest,' and a supreme example of the cold brilliance which is imputed to the poet. Shelley rejoins boldly to this criticism in the prefatory lines *To Mary*. His wife seems to have been holding up Wordsworth as an example[1]. 'Well,' he answers in effect, 'take *Peter Bell*. That is what you would call an actual and human poem; I call it lifeless, a thing of saws and instances. In my etherial Witch the life flows free as the metre in which I sing of her; see into her real Nature, and she will appeal, not to your moral sentiment, but to love and passion.' And passion, in the high and importunate mode of it which Shelley knew in himself, is plainly a part of the theme. The Witch, like the youth in *Alastor*, is smitten with a quenchless thirst for a love which earth cannot give her. Were she of the earth she might find a mate; but she is immortal and so alone. So she creates the Hermaphrodite for her solace. The Hermaphrodite appears to stand for the Imagination, the faculty which brings the world into harmony and in which all oppositions are reconciled, fire and snow, male and female. It is a fair companion, but it cannot bring the Witch heartsease[2]. Again, many critics from Swinburne onwards have agreed that the Lady represents that *anima mundi* which is the alpha and omega of Shelley's faith. Her presence is felt from end to end of Nature; she must shroud her glory from sight, as Prometheus bids Asia do; she is the beneficent humour in the body of things. Here, then, is a seeming contradiction. On the one hand she is a symbol of the idealistic mind, of natures like Shelley's own, fraught in this life with a tragic insatiability. Such minds turn to art for an

[1] She had apparently preached Byron's example as well. The expression 'the purest sky, Where the swan sings amid the Sun's dominions' (ll. 11, 12) recalls the 'tempest-cleaving Swan of Albion' in the *Lines written among the Euganean Hills*.

[2] Shelley, writing to Hogg, Dec. 3, 1812, applies the word 'hermaphroditical,' along with other opprobrious terms, to the unfortunate Miss Hitchener. We may infer that the idea 'Hermaphrodite' was bound up in his mind with the significance 'unfeeling, incapable of returning love.'

embodiment of their ideal; and perhaps the magic boat, which could not contain the fires of Venus and so was bought by Apollo, or, as others feign, grew from a seed planted and tended by Cupid in his Mother's star (XXXI f.), stands for the art which is inspired by love but cannot satisfy it. Shelley seldom imagines a river without thinking of it allegorically. In *Mont Blanc* the torrent of the Arve reminds him of the race of thought and impression in the human mind; and the forest stream in *Alastor* (502 ff.) calls up the same image to the wanderer. Asia in the *Prometheus* (II, v 72 ff.) dreams that she embarks with her lover in a boat that floats down a river past crags, whirlpools, and caverns to an immeasurable sea. The river, as the poet proceeds to explain, is the River of Life; the crags and whirlpools are the moral dangers of youth and age; the sea is Eternity. The Witch of Atlas was probably floating down the same stream with her Hermaphrodite. When they follow the stream's course the Hermaphrodite is more or less dormant; which means, perhaps, that the objective art, the art which describes life as it comes, is not the fullest exercise of the Imagination; but when the Witch will speed up stream to the sources of the river (that is, when the mind turns to the high contemplative art), the Hermaphrodite must wake and use all the power of his wings. On the other hand the Witch is not only the human idealist, but no less distinctly the Divine Principle. The solution of the difficulty seems to be provided by the lyric just referred to in the *Prometheus Unbound*. Beyond a doubt that lyric is an allegory; and it will admit of no interpretation unless we can see in Asia (so far as these lines go) not the Divinity in general, but the Divinity in Man, as 'piloted' by Man, sharing his course, and working through his actions. Prometheus having freed himself, Asia can join him, and together they will escape the perils of youth and age and attain to Eternity, which in Shelley means a certain mode of holiness (ll. 98 f.). Just as in the *Prometheus* Asia is now the Divine Love in all the world and now the spark of it in Man, so in *The Witch of Atlas* the poet passes without warning from the larger aspect to the smaller. The more of the divine there is in a man, the more will he thirst for love and miss the full fruition of it. Nay, the Divine Spirit throughout Nature is conscious of the same want. Must the Spirit, then, for ever suffer in this mystery of pain? The answer is not given in *The Witch of Atlas*, but it is given frequently elsewhere by Shelley, and belongs to the root of his philosophy. The Divinity, and we as parts of it, suffer a sort of Fall by entering Time or Nature, by

undergoing 'the eclipsing curse of birth.' But the Spirit may one day slough off Time and Nature, and withdraw again to its transcendental self, in which is all fulness. There the light of being will be no more broken and depreciated by the dome of many-coloured glass which Death tramples to fragments. Thus the poem is quick with that sublimation of the sexual desire which Shelley has somewhere called 'the wine of life'; though there are many who cannot bring their lips to the drink for the strangeness of the cup. And it is a deliberate sentence which he passes on Wordsworth in comparing his own poem with *Peter Bell.* In Wordsworth, he thought (cf. *Peter Bell the Third,* IV, xi f.), that wine of life is scant and thin.

A. M. D. Hughes.

Kiel.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

The Original 'Romeo and Juliet.'

I think it has not yet been noted by Shaksperean students that Arthur Brooke, the author of *The Tragicall Historye of Romeus and Juliet* (published by Richard Tottell on Nov. 19, 1562) was concerned in the production of plays at the Inner Temple at Christmas, 1561. The entry (to which I was courteously given access at the Treasurer's Office of the Inn) is part of the proceedings of a Parliament of the Inn held on Feb. 4, 1562, and runs thus:

> Item y^{t} arthur broke shall have a sp.iall admittance w^{t}out anything paying in consideration of certen playes & showes in chrm^{s} last, set forth by hym.

In the preface to his poem Brooke said that he had seen the same argument 'lately set foorth on stage with more commendation, then I can looke for: (being there much better set forth then I have or can dooe).' It seems likely that the tragedy Brooke had in mind was produced at one of the Inns of Court, for it was, of course, before the days of the regular theatres, and all the four early classical tragedies that have survived were so produced, *Gorboduc* and *Gismond of Salerne* at the Inner Temple, *Jocasta* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* at Gray's Inn. It is possible that this early *Romeo and Juliet* was presented at the Inner Temple at Christmas, 1561, and that this drew Brooke's attention to the subject; the terms of his reference seem to imply that he was not the author of the tragedy. It is true that there is no mention of any such play in the records of the Inner Temple, but neither is there of *Gorboduc*, which we know was presented there at that time. Inderwick says (*A Calendar of the Inner Temple Records*): 'There are no entries, in our now existing records, of any particular play in our own hall before the reign of James I.'

My suggestion is little more than speculation, but it may be pardoned in view of the absence of known facts. Two theories on the subject may be said to hold the field. Hunter (*New Illustrations of Shakespeare*, vol. II, p. 130) and Courthope (*History of English Poetry*, vol. IV, p. 100) suggest that Brooke referred to a Latin tragedy among the Sloane MSS. in the British Museum. Dr Harold de W. Fuller

(*Modern Philology*, vol. IV, pp. 75—120), after a careful examination of the Latin tragedy, is of opinion that it was based on Brooke, and was probably written by a Cambridge student after 1605. Dr Fuller's theory is that Brooke refers to an English play, composed between 1559 and 1562, and now represented by a Dutch version entitled *Romeo en Juliette*. There is, of course, no conflict between Dr Fuller's theory and the suggestion now made.

JOHN W. CUNLIFFE.

NEW YORK.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF 'ROISTER.'

The accepted etymology, from Fr. *rustre*, Lat. *rusticus*, is based on Cotgrave's gloss for *rustre*, 'a ruffin, *royster*, hackester, swaggerer; sawcie, paultry, scurvy fellow.' It seems to me out of the question to identify this *rustre* with Lat. *rusticus*, which would rather be explained as 'a clowne, boore, churle, hob, hinde, swayne, lobcock, rude or unmannerly lozell' (Cotgrave's gloss to *rustault*). Littré quotes from Brantôme, s.v. *rustre*, 'D'autres les ont appelez *rustres* (certains soldats) ainsi que nous lisons dans le roman de M. de Bayard, que M. de Bayard dit à ses *rustres*, appellan(s) ainsi ceux auxquels il commandoit.' This passage is possibly the origin of Cotgrave's *rustre*. Now the original of *roister* ought to be something of the nature of a *Miles gloriosus* or *Franc Archier de Bagnolet*, for the verb to *roist*, a back-formation from *roister*, is rendered *jactare* by the Latin dictionaries of the seventeenth century. I propose *reister*, a horse-soldier, bravo, a common word in seventeenth century English, from Fr. *reistre*, 'a *reister*, or swart-rutter, a German horseman' (Cotgrave). This *reistre*, now *reître*, is Ger. *Reiter*, with intrusive *s*. In sixteenth century French it occurs commonly in the sense of mercenary ruffian, and is so far associated with *routier* (from *route*, band) that *un vieux reître* and *un vieux routier* are interchangeable terms for an old soldier with the implied meaning of desperado. From about 1450 to 1750 Ger. *Reiter* is generally replaced by *Reuter*, 'a *reiter* or *reister*' (Ludwig, 1715), cf. Du. *ruiter*. Kluge regards the Dutch word as ultimately identical with Fr. *routier*, but Franck dissents. However that may be, the earliest form of the Dutch word is *rûter*, and, as we have Fr. *reistre* from Ger. *Reiter*, it seems reasonable to accept Fr. *rustre* from Du. *rûter* or from the early German form *rüter* (Weigand). This would explain Cotgrave's gloss to *rustre* and also the meaning of the English word, which, I fancy, owes more to *reister* than to *rustre*; for the vowel change cf. *boil* for *bile*. The

intrusive *s* of the two French words *reistre* and *rustre* is to be explained by the influence of such Renaissance spellings as *maistre, traistre,* etc. It is true that in such words the *s* does not usually affect the sound, but we have a parallel to the sounded *s* of *reistre, rustre* in Fr. *flibustier,* earlier *fribustier,* from Du. *vrybuiter,* freebooter.

Ernest Weekley.

Nottingham.

A Herrick Reading.

Herrick's 'Dean-bourn, a rude River in Devon by which sometimes he lived' is one of the best known of the *Hesperides* poems, but what is by no means so well known is that almost every modern editor of Herrick's works, from Hazlitt and Grosart onwards, has seen fit to tamper with the text. As a consequence, Professor Boas in his otherwise most friendly review of my life of Herrick (*Mod. Lang. Rev.* vol. VII, p. 382) took me rather severely to task for introducing what seemed to him a grotesque misquotation of the poem,—in reality a restoration of the original text. In the original edition the first two verses read as follows:

> *Dean-bourn*, farewell; I never look to see
> *Deane*, or thy warty incivility.

In modern editions 'watry' or 'watery' is substituted for 'warty,' and the force of the whole poem is thereby impaired. A study of the succeeding verses will, I think, make this clear. They read as follows:

> Thy rockie bottome, that doth teare thy streams,
> And makes them frantick, ev'n to all extreames;
> To my content, I never sho'd behold,
> Were thy streames silver, or thy rocks all gold.
> Rockie thou art; and rockie we discover
> Thy men; and rockie are thy wayes all over.

It will be seen that what Herrick objects to in Dean Burn is its rockiness. The whole poem turns upon this, and with the rockiness of the stream's bed he compares the rockiness of the ways of the people who live by it. Now the use of the word 'warty,' in the sense of rocky, in l. 2, seems to me not only justifiable, but highly characteristic of the poet. Moreover, 'watry incivility,' if read in the light of the poem as a whole, is meaningless. The incivility of the stream in Herrick's eyes consists, not in its wateriness, but in its 'wartiness': what he would have liked would have been more water and fewer 'warts.' And I, who have known Dean Burn since my childhood, am inclined to agree with him.

F. W. Moorman.

Leeds.

DISCUSSIONS.

The Name of the Letter ȝ.

The remarkably thorough and able investigations of Miss A. C. Paues (*Modern Language Review*, October, 1911) have proved that the form *yok*, occurring in one MS. of the northern English version of Mandeville, is an incorrect representation of the name by which the letter ȝ was known in the fourteenth century, and that the original name was *ȝoȝ*.

I think, however, that the hypothesis which Miss Paues has propounded with regard to the ultimate origin of the name is untenable. She regards *ȝoȝ* as a later form of *eoh*, the name of the thirteenth rune of the Anglian futhorc. Her supposition is that when the Angles learned the Roman letters from the Irish missionaries, they were struck by the resemblance in shape between the letter G (in Irish handwriting) and the thirteenth letter of their native alphabet, and that on this account they adopted *eoh* as their name for the Roman letter. It is conceded that the original sound of the rune, whatever it may have been, had been forgotten, the various phonetic values with which the rune is used in three inscriptions being mere inferences from its traditional name.

Now it is quite inconceivable that the Irish missionaries, when they taught the Roman alphabet to their English converts, confined their teaching to the forms of the letters and the sounds which they expressed, leaving their pupils to provide names for them according to their own fancy. Surely a foreign alphabet was never taught in this inconvenient fashion. The shapes of the letters and their traditional names together always form the first stage of instruction; their use in representing sounds has to be learned afterwards. I do not know that we have any information as to the names by which the Roman letters were called in England before the Norman Conquest. But it is highly probable that the English used the same set of names that were current in the rest of the world, of course modified in pronunciation according to English habits of articulation. The alphabetic name of G would accordingly be *gē*, which at the end of the O.E. period would be pronounced nearly like the modern English word *yea*.

It might perhaps be contended that when instruction in reading and writing had passed from the hands of foreigners into those of natives, the schoolmasters may have chosen to discard the Latin names of the letters, and replace them by English names of their own invention. Something of this kind seems actually to have been done in Ireland. There is, however, no evidence that the English did set aside the

Roman letter-names which they must once have been taught. But if they had done so, they would presumably have followed the 'acrologic' principle of nomenclature; i.e., they would have chosen a set of English words beginning with the letters that were to be named. If they were influenced by the runic tradition, they would have called the letter G either *gifu* or *gār*; if they preferred to be independent of it, they might have called it *gold* or *geat*. But it is against all analogy to suppose that they would adopt *eoh* as the name of G, merely because the *shape* of the Roman letter had some resemblance to that of the character called *eoh* in the futhorc. The inconvenience of having a letter-name that has no relation to the sound is sometimes tolerated when a traditional name (e.g., our 'aitch' or 'wy') has lost its original phonetic appropriateness owing to sound change, or when a new letter has arisen out of an old one through functional and formal differentiation (so 'double-U' and the Italian 'I lungo' for J); but such anomalies have never been deliberately created. We may be sure that so long as the letter ϝ was in actual use the Greeks did not call it 'digamma.'

Miss Paues's hypothesis must therefore, I think, be dismissed from consideration. The true explanation of the origin of the name ȝoȝ is, in my opinion, not difficult to discover.

The history of the symbol ȝ (which was merely a less careful variant of ȝ, the Old English form of the letter *g*) is perfectly well known. Late in the twelfth century certain Englishmen, who had been taught to read and write French but not their native language, essayed to write English books in the French script and in a phonetic spelling that would be intelligible to persons whose education was similar to their own. They were met by the difficulty that English had several sounds that did not exist in French, and therefore could not be correctly expressed in French orthography. Two of these sounds, the guttural and the palatal voiced spirant, had in O.E. been expressed by the letter G, which also stood for the two sounds that it had in French. Some Middle English scribes used the ordinary French form of *g* for all the four sounds which the letter had represented in O.E. But this must often have been a stumbling-block to their readers, and other scribes, better advised, revived the old insular form of the letter in its two spirant values. The result was that ȝ was added as a new letter to the French alphabet as used in writing English.

The new letter required a name. Miss Paues is quite right in saying that it would have been natural to adopt the Old English name, and perhaps some persons did so, for there seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the genuineness of the 'ye' of the Trinity MS. Other persons, however, preferred to call the letter ȝoȝ, which had the advantage of indicating both its phonetic values at once. I feel little doubt that the suggestion came from the word ȝoȝoþ (youth), and it is not impossible that this word was at first employed unabbreviated as an alphabetic name.

Henry Bradley.

Oxford.

English Metric.

Had not Mr Rudmose-Brown's criticism of my *Essai sur les Principes de la Métrique anglaise* appeared in so distinguished a periodical as *The Modern Language Review*[1], I should not have thought it worth while to reply to his gross misrepresentations. But to such as have not read the book, his censure of it may seem to be just. Therefore, after much hesitation, I have at last resolved on attempting an answer.

First of all, I must appeal to the reader's forbearance. My *Métrique anglaise* was conceived and almost entirely written a good many years ago, and from that time I have given up English studies for other pursuits. I am afraid the style and language of this article will prove to be awkward and deficient, if not faulty.

My bulky essay consists of three parts, the purport of which is clearly shown by their respective titles: in Vol. I, *Métrique auditive*, I tried to ascertain the laws and forms of English rhythm by ear; in Vol. II, *Théorie générale du rythme*, I investigated the nature, perception, origin and evolution of rhythm and metre, with special reference to English poetry; in Vol. III, *Notes de métrique expérimentale*, I resorted to experimental phonetics in order to analyze a few samples of English prose and verse, as delivered by Mme Duclaux (Mary Robinson), the well-known English poetess, Mr La., an English and German master in an English public school, and Mr Le., an English man of letters. At the very outset, Mr Rudmose-Brown asserts that all my arguments are drawn from Mr La.'s and Mr Le.'s pronunciation, which *a priori* he discards with insulting haughtiness ("the pronunciation of the man in the street," "the garbling of two Toms or Dicks," p. 231), or from "the rendering of a distinguished foreigner," M. Beljame (p. 231). This, he cannot but know, is untrue. In the first two volumes, as far as regards modern English verse—though I occasionally referred in a foot-note to my records as corroborating mere auditory observation—I only depended on the pronunciation I have heard from the lips of my English friends, most of whom belong to literary families, are cultivated people, with a sensitive ear for poetry, and in every sense "educated and artistically competent" Englishmen (p. 231—cf. e.g. I, p. 125). M. Beljame I fairly often quoted: Mr Rudmose-Brown infers that I blindly rely on "M. Beljame's aid"; Professor Saintsbury, that my book seems to have been "planned almost as a direct polemic against the late M. Alexandre Beljame" (*History of English Prosody*, III, p. 466). It is obvious that one at least must be wrong. In fact, both are. In order to avoid idle discussions on the pronunciation of my examples, I endeavoured as often as possible to choose lines on the accentuation of which I fully agree with champions of traditional metric, such as Mr Abbott, Mr Mayor, and especially M. Beljame, who was to be my

[1] Vol. VI (1911), pp. 230—240. References to his article will be easily distinguished from those to my book because the latter are always preceded by the indication of the volume (I, II, or III). All remarks of mine inside quotations are put between square brackets.

examiner, and whose little treatise on English verse is widely used in France—Professor Saintsbury highly commends his knowledge and pronunciation of English (*l. c.* p. 467). But whether I agree with these metrists or not, I alone am responsible for the pronunciation indicated; and I do not see that Mr Rudmose-Brown ever takes exception to my "stress-accents": he only objects to my advocacy of isochronism and my scansions.

According to his criticism, it would seem that my book was only or mostly concerned with isochronism. The headings of the chapters and sub-chapters would suffice to show that this is not so. I minutely analyzed the sounds, syllabication, accents, quantities, intonations, rhythms, rhymes and metres of the English language. Even if the theory of isochronism be rejected, nearly the whole of the first volume will none the less hold good. This also applies to the scansion which I support: it divides verse into *bars* ("measures," "feet") *measured from beat to beat* ("ictus," "*temps marqué*"). Any other scansion chops the lines into irreconcilable fragments, i.e. fragments which often have nothing in common, neither the position of the beat nor the number of the syllables.

Mr Rudmose-Brown will no doubt protest against this assertion, which he ascribes to my ignoring "alternation." I do not ignore it. I have explained how all speech tends to alternation (I, pp. 53—62, II, pp. 96—101), the English language to binary alternation—i.e. weak, strong, weak, strong, etc. (*ib.*, and especially I, § 200)—which binary alternation is the basis of English rhythm, as well in prose as in verse. The metre of heroic verse I represent as alternating[1]:

A *lance* that splinter'd like an *icicle*.
w s w s w s w sws

But Mr Rudmose-Brown's "alternation" is something more refined and subtle. To ordinary mortals, alternation means the regular recurrence of one thing after another. To Mr Rudmose-Brown, it means a promiscuous and disorderly alternation of different degrees of either stress or pitch, i.e. now of strong (s) with weak (w), now of high (h) with low (l). In his scansion of the following lines the "ictus" (') is marked either by "stress-accent" (s) or by "pitch-accent" (h) indiscriminately:

Suddénly flásh'd on hér a wíld desíre.
l h w s w s w s w s
This précious stóne set ín the sílver séa.
w s w s l h w s w s
Ruggéd and dárk, windíng amóng the springs.
l h w s l h w s w s
Take yóur own tíme, Anníe, take yóur own tíme.
l h w s l h l h w s

First of all, I doubt very much if his analysis of pitch is correct[2]. Let us grant it. But by what mystery can the ear, without any warning,

[1] s = strong (syllable), a syllable which receives the beat, i.e. a relative increase of force or intensity; w = weak (syllable), any other syllable. The position of the beat in the line is indicated by italics.

[2] Cf. Verrier, *Questions de Métrique anglaise*, Paris, 1912, 6, Rem. 1.

recognize the mark of ictus now in stress, now in pitch,—especially as the stronger syllable in any of the groups 'weak + strong' may at the same time be the lower? The "ictus" in this scansion is only indicated by the order of the syllables: it recurs with every other syllable. How, then, am I to discover in the following lines that it falls, not on '-ly,' '-ble' and '-cent,' but on 'rang,' 'cry' and 'soul'?

So thése were wéd and mérrily ráng the bélls.
He sént abróad a shríll and térrible crý.
The líttle ínnocent sóul flittéd awáy.

And what of this line—

The sóund of mány a héavily gálloping hóof—?

It might be argued that the ear was guided by there being no increase of force, or rise of pitch, or lengthening of sound in '-ly,' '-ble,' '-cent,' etc., when compared with the syllable respectively preceding. In fact there is, not only one or the other, but generally all three together, so that the ear may well mistake this triple reinforcement for an "ictus" and feel somewhat at a loss on finding that the next syllable is not followed by a higher or stronger one, as 'beat' is in

But néver mérrilý beat Ánnie's héart.

Anyhow, the "alternation" is destroyed: we no longer have "ictus, no ictus, ictus," but "ictus, no ictus, no ictus, ictus."

Mr Rudmose-Brown sees the difficulty, and he is ready with an explanation: "The word 'merrily' in the first line is intended to be read as a dissyllable" (p. 236, note 1). Does he really pronounce 'merr'ly,' 'terr'ble,' etc.? If a Scotchman, he can perhaps manage it. In fact nobody *does* maim the words in this way. How, then—again—can we hear where the "ictus" appears, if it is not indicated by the position of the syllable, but either by force or pitch promiscuously?

Not only is it impossible to understand how rhythm might be indiscriminately determined now by stress and now by pitch, but it has been proved by Mr Herbert Woodrow's scientific experiments that rhythm has nothing whatever to do with pitch, except as far as pitch is an element of force (*Psychological Review*, XVIII, 1911, pp. 54—77). The ictus, therefore, is only marked by an increase of force, and the lines are to be scanned in this way:

So these were wed and merrily rang the bells.
w s w s w s w w s w s
Suddenly flash'd on her a wild desire.
s w w s w s w s w s (s)
The little innocent soul flitted away.
w s w s w w s s w w s
Rugged and dark, winding among the springs[1].
s w w s s w w s w s

[1] I scan Shelley's line in this way,—*not* "because...it matches part of Swinburne's real greater asclepiad,

Áh! thy lúminous éyes! Ónce was their light féd with the fire of dáy."

(p. 236, note 2), but because its rhythm requires it.

It is perfectly true that in the first line the three syllables of 'merrily' only count as two: they only take up the time of a regular dissyllabic bar. But this would mean nothing whatever if that time were not fixed, i.e. if the bars of the line were not isochronous. And if rhythm does not rest on isochronism, it rests on nothing—it does not exist: in the above lines there is no other constant regularity but isochronism.

To my mind, therefore, and to that of nearly all English metrists, English verse is always accentual: the strong syllables are strong by reason of their stress, be they never so slightly stressed in comparison with the weak ones.

As already pointed out, I am far from denying alternation in English poetry, e.g. in the 'metre' of heroic verse. But I cannot acknowledge two different English rhythms: one "accentual," the other "alternating." It would be strange for any versification to be based upon two "entirely different" principles (p. 231). And such is not the case with English verse. That the rhythm is not always alternating in actual heroic lines has been sufficiently shown by the preceding examples, where the beats are separated either by two or three syllables. In Mr Rudmose-Brown's "accentual rhythm" the ictus is signalized, not by the order of the syllables, but by full stress:

> Hanging so light, and hanging so high,
> On the topmost twig that looks up at the sky.
>
> COLERIDGE, *Christabel.*

> Our purses are empty, our swords are cold,
> Give us glory, and blood, and gold.
>
> SHELLEY, *The Masque of Anarchy.*

Now it very often happens in "accentual verse" that a strong syllable is not "stressed":

> Beautiful exceedingly.
> s w s w s w s
> Is the night chilly and dark?
> s w s s w w s
>
> *Christabel.*

> Clothed with the Bible as with light,
> s w w s w s w s
> And the shadows of the night.
> s w s w s w s
>
> *The Masque of Anarchy.*

As the "rhythm" is therefore neither "accentual" nor "alternating," or "syllabic," what is it? It no longer exists. And how can unrhythmic lines be harmonious? Mr Rudmose-Brown means this disregard of "rhythm" when he says: "Shelley ne soigne pas trop sa versification, qui échappe à toutes les règles" (*Étude comparée de la Versification française et de la Versification anglaise*, Grenoble, 1905, p. 129). This has nothing to do with the occasional disregard of metre, which I pointed out in Shelley's verse (I, pp. 206, 300): I did not impeach his rhythm, far from it.

Differences there are, of course, and very great ones sometimes, as to the force of the rhythm—differences also, and often very striking ones, with regard to alternation or syllabism. All this I note most carefully. But Mr Rudmose-Brown's distinction between an "accentual" and an "alternating" rhythm, I think it impossible to accept.

If anyone, on the other hand, "insists on confusing these two species of rhythm," viz. *rising* and *falling* (p. 232), who is it? Not I, surely, in spite of Mr Rudmose-Brown's assertion that on account of this confusion my "whole treatment of 'anacruse' becomes the merest and most pernicious nonsense" (p. 234). Rather it is he, together with all traditional metrists. This distinction I not only lay down as an important principle (I, pp. 153—157), but I apply it whenever I find an opportunity. Mr Rudmose-Brown and traditional metrists also contend that they do. But how? Let us examine a few examples of their "rising" and "falling" rhythm (I group the symbols w and s according to the real syllable-grouping):

A ("rising")

1. I slip, I slide, I gloom, I glance.
   w s w s w s w s
2. But ilk ane sits dreary, lamenting her deary.
   w s w w s w w s w w s w
3. In brambly wildernesses.
   w s w s w s w
4. This pretty, puny, weakly little one.
   w s w s w s w s w s
5. Beautiful Paris, evil-hearted Paris.
   s w w s w s w s w s w
6. Ready to spring; waiting a chance: for this.
   s w w s s w w s w s

B ("falling")

7. Pansies, lilies, kingcups, daisies.
   s w s w s w s w
8. Gathering up from all the lower ground.
   s w w s w s w s w s
9. Heart within and God o'erhead.
   s w s w s w s
10. Strong with the strength of the race to command, to obey, to endure.
    s w w s w w s w w s w w s w w s (s)

The rhythm, to my ear, is purely rising in 1, purely falling in 5 and 7, in the main rising in 8, 9 and 10, in the main falling in 3 and 4, rising-falling in 2, falling-rising in 6. Who is right[1]? Will Mr Rudmose-Brown object that "metrics and phonetics do not necessarily divide

[1] 4 (*Enoch Arden*), 5 (*Œnone*) and 6 (*Enoch Arden*) are heroic lines; 8 (Tennyson's *Vision of Sin*) a 'trochaic' one. "On p. 201 M. Verrier shows how rising scansion disfigures certain trochaic and dactylic verses. Of course it does. Nothing is proved. No one wants to scan trochaic verse with rising scansion" (p. 236, note 1). Out of sixteen lines which I represented as disfigured by rising scansion (I, pp. 199—*201*), twelve are 'iambic' (I, pp. 199—*201*), one—according to Mr Mayor—'anapæstic' (I, p. *201*), two 'mixed' or 'accentual' (I, pp. 200 and *201*), and only one 'trochaic' (I, p. 199, not *201*). The reader may judge how far he can rely on my critic's assertions.

speech into the same groups or in the same way" (p. 236)? Phonetics divides it in accordance with what we *hear*. If Mr Rudmose-Brown's "metrics" divides it otherwise, what is it but arbitrary dogmatism?

To him the distinction between rising and falling is in fact merely one between verse with anacrusis and verse without anacrusis. Though I observed that the anacrusis sometimes appears or disappears in the same poem—which he, to some extent, admits (p. 236)—I did not make it "a matter of moonshine" (*ib.*): in my eyes it is part of the verse as well as any other syllable, and an important part (I, § 237).

The anacrusis, or initial weak syllable of a line or a section, is compared with the following, not the preceding, syllable (I, §§ 240 and 260). There is accordingly no inconsistency on my part—as Mr Rudmose-Brown would have it (p. 232, note 3)—when I prefer to consider 'beat' as an interior anacrusis after the cæsura of this line:

But never merrily beat Annie's heart.

Mr Rudmose-Brown finds fault with my treatment not only of English but also of French verse. All metrists admit that in the singing of our old octosyllabics, the beat (italics) had only to coincide with the usual prose-stress (·) on the fourth and eighth syllables:

·Granz *fu* li ·dols, ·fort marri·menz.

"All this is very doubtful," says Mr Rudmose-Brown (p. 237). Who but only he will deny, first, that there was a stress, in the current pronunciation of the words, on the syllables here preceded by a turned point? secondly, that in song the vowels here printed in italics received the beat? As both phenomena are nothing but an increase of force, it follows that in case of discrepancy between the beat and the prose-stress the latter was more or less neglected, nay, simply thrown over, and then ceased to exist (II, p. 145). This actual shifting of accent still very often occurs in modern French song, in the second stanza of the *Marseillaise*, for instance, where it even emphasizes usually mute *e*'s[1]:

Que ·veut cette ·horde d'es·claves,
De ·traîtres, de ·rois conju·rés.

Mr Rudmose-Brown's objection to it is the more astonishing as he himself—if I understand him correctly—wrongly requires it in the rhythm of our modern spoken verse. The following alexandrine he wants us to read in this way:

Le soleil le revêt d'éclatantes couleurs.

Why? Because a Swede (Professor Wulff), three Germans (Professors Saran, Stengel and Tobler) and an Englishman (Mr Rudmose-Brown) enjoin it? As I venture to remark in a foot-note that "comme on voit, je ne partage pas l'avis de MM. Wulff, Tobler, Stengel et Saran" (II,

[1] Common time: $\frac{4}{4} = \frac{2}{4} + \frac{2}{4}$. The first or stronger beat of the measure is indicated by **full-face**, the second or weaker beat by *italics*.

p. 142, note 3), this modest statement of my—a Frenchman's—opinion on French pronunciation is a "contemptuous dismissal" (p. 237), an "attack on Professor Saran" (p. 238). *My* opinion? Why, *all* French people, metrists and others, read thus:

Le soleil le revêt d'éclatantes couleurs.

As this is a question, not of mere scansion, but of pronunciation, we cannot but be right. At any rate, this is how we *do* pronounce and, accordingly, how we scan. Or is our verse to be scanned after a few Swedes' or Germans' and one Englishman's imaginary pronunciation? But to Mr Rudmose-Brown, our reading and scanning of our own verse is the "abomination of desolation" (p. 238). We "speak verse as if it were prose" (*ib.*). This is quite new to me: most foreigners reproach us with reciting our poetry in an artificial manner, entirely different from our usual pronunciation of prose. They say we sing our verse. And so, to some extent, we do. I really am at a loss how to understand Mr Rudmose-Brown's obloquy[1].

After referring to my statement that "aujourd'hui le rythme de nos vers repose sur l'accentuation," he concludes: "In other words, the alexandrine has to-day the metre (more or less) of

The Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold

mingled (to taste) with that of:

Thus, rolling in her burning breast, she strait to Acolia hied[2],

in other words, is a hash of irreconcilable fragments" (p. 237). Our alexandrine is thus assumed to resemble—in our pronunciation and scansion—now the first line, now the second, now a section of the one coupled with a section of the other. I wonder when it can, with its twelve syllables and normal four beats, match the metre of the English septenary or fourteener. Never as a whole, of course, and hardly ever in one of its parts.

Trying to explain Professor Saran's error about French rhythm, I dared to advance that he often mistakes a more or less slight secondary stress for an ictus (II, p. 142, note 3). For one of my examples, 'à ·peine un petit ·nombre,' I even gave a phonetic transcription in order to point out the secondary stress, namely that on 'pe-.'

[1] I may possibly propitiate him by openly confessing that I in no wise claim to be as clever as Professor Saran, who does not only invent new words, new symbols and even a new French rhythm, but also creates people out of nothing, one L. Reinach, for instance, quoted by him as being the author of *Aperçus de Métrique comparée* (*Der Rhythmus des französischen Verses*, Halle, 1904, pp. 188 and 202—3). I thought *I* had written that article (signed L. R., i.e. Paul Verrier). Of course, I was wrong: Professor Saran knows better, as he does with regard to our pronunciation of verse. We French know nothing: we do not know how we pronounce, or how we ought to pronounce, or if we exist and under what name. I very humbly confess to it. I hope Mr Rudmose-Brown is satisfied.

[2] As I cannot procure the text,—which I take to be Phaer's translation of *Aeneid*, I, 50,—I have not corrected what I assume to be misprints: the comma after 'thus,' and 'Acolia' instead of 'Aeolia.' The line is a septenary (seven beats) or fourteener (fourteen syllables, the *o* in 'to' being regarded as elided and the *i* in 'Aeolia' as slurred).

Mr Rudmose-Brown again attacks me: "Whatever M. Verrier says, these hemistichs cannot, even in everyday prose, be pronounced without a slight stress (the least will be sufficient) on one or other of the unstressed syllables between the stresses marked" (p. 237). What else did I say? How, again, am I to understand Mr Rudmose-Brown[1]?

Neither do I understand him when he charges me with "maligning" some verses of Shakespeare's (p. 234). He asks indignantly why they "should therefore become mere prose and be hanged forthwith" (p. 235). I only said that blank verse, owing to a frequency of weak endings and run-on lines, often becomes a sort of "prose rythmée" (I, p. 181), and I added: "Cette transformation du rythme stichique en rythme indéfini peut présenter les mêmes avantages que la substitution de la mélodie continue à la mélodie carrée dans la musique contemporaine: le rythme y gagne beaucoup en souplesse, en variété, en richesse, en ampleur." This kind of rhythm I particularly alluded to in the concluding words of my first volume: thanks to "ces transformations multiples par lesquelles il ressemble sous tant de rapports au rythme de la musique moderne," the rhythm of English poetry has become "cet admirable instrument riche en harmonies de toute sorte et si bien approprié au libre génie de la race anglaise—cette

God-gifted organ-voice of England."

If this is "maligning," I am afraid Mr Rudmose-Brown attaches to this word quite a different meaning from the usual one. Nor do I maintain that even the freest sort of blank verse is mere rhythmic prose.

A few rearranged lines of Milton (I, pp. 177 and 184) were precisely adduced in order to show that we must—especially on account of the line-cadence—"conserver à la prose rythmée du *blank verse* a division traditionnelle en vers" (I, p. 183; cf. pp. 177—178). In Vol. II, p. 217, note 1, I brought forward additional arguments to the same effect: "Ces remarques s'appliquent aussi au *blank verse*, malgré sa ressemblance avec la prose rythmée: si vague qu'en puisse devenir le mètre, comme dans les derniers drames de Shakespeare, il n'en reste pas moins par sa familiarité le fond sur lequel le poète brode ses variations, le cadre au moins subjectif dans lequel se déroule pour nous, en le débordant plus ou moins, la peinture auditive de chaque vers."

Mr Rudmose-Brown does not only give to my words or his own, but also to the technical terms of logic, quite a different meaning from the current one: "When we at last, after many preliminaries, reach the experiments on verse proper, we are brought up by the assertion, in reference to heroic verse: *'Puisque le rythme du vers est accentuel'*

[1] By concentrating our attention on weak sounds we can make them louder to our perception than strong ones, the tick of a watch, for instance, in opposition to the tick of a clock (see Wundt, *Phys. Psychol.*, 5th ed., Leipzig, 1902–3, III, p. 25). As this also applies to syllables, a prejudiced metrist will easily hear the beat of the verse in the wrong place. I suggested that such might be the case with Prof. Saran, &c. (II, p. 142, note 3). Perhaps it partially explains Mr Rudmose-Brown's illusion with regard to English 'alternating rhythm.'

(the italics are mine), 'le temps marqué ne saurait correspondre à un phénomène quelconque, mais seulement à un phénomène accentuel, tel que le maximum ou l'accroissement maximum de l'intensité, qui se trouvent toutes [*sic*] deux dans la voyelle'—as fine an example of *petitio principii* as one could meet with" (p. 239). What is the real fact? As an obvious reason for not regarding a certain point in initial consonants as the bearer of the ictus, I *occasionally* urged this: since (as has been demonstrated) English verse is accentual, the ictus must correspond to an accentual phenomenon, which cannot be found at the point indicated (III, p. 189, ll. 12—25). When you read in a scientific primer: "Since (as has been demonstrated) the locus consists of all the points equidistant from *A*, it can be nothing but the circumference of a circle," you surely do not call this a *petitio principii*, but a deduction. I beg the reader's pardon for fetching an illustration from mathematics, the most abstract, but also the most logical, of sciences.

I especially apologize to Mr Rudmose-Brown, who does not seem to be very much acquainted with mathematics or even with simple logic. Talking of a line, the four bars of which respectively occupy 61, 54, 56 and 52 hundredths of a second, he kindly insinuates that I divided these numbers by ten—thus getting 6, 5, 6, 5—in order to make the 'double bars' or dipodies look equal: $6+5=11$, $6+5=11$. He "must protest against M. Verrier's arithmetic" (p. 239). I beg to protest against Mr Rudmose-Brown's quite un-British notion of fair play. I only wanted to show that within certain limits—which after all might be the correct ones—those double bars are equal. The choice of a time-unit in experimental metric is as yet largely conventional. I generally use the *cs.* or centisecond (hundredth of a second), partly because my tracings or my measurements would hardly be reliable with a lower unit, such as the *ms.* or millisecond (thousandth of a second). Why not the *ds.* or decisecond (tenth of a second) as well, especially when we have longer intervals to deal with[1]? And does Mr Rudmose-Brown know of any other method of converting centiseconds into deciseconds than division by ten? Which here gives $6+5=11$ ds. and $6+5=11$ ds. But—for what reason I do not know, neither does he—he insists upon having 115 cs. ($=61+54$) and 108 cs. ($=56+52$) or, which comes to the same, 11·5 ds. and 10·8 ds.—that is upon having the centiseconds. Unless I arrive at 115 and 115 cs. or 108 and 108 cs., he will not be satisfied that the double bars are equal. Is he really unaware that by 115 cs. is meant a number between 1145·1 ms. and 1155·0 ms., by 108 cs. a number between 1075·1 ms. and 1085·0 ms., with a possible difference of 9·9 ms.? Where are we?

No two things are really equal: they are only equal within certain limits. Within which limits—deciseconds, centiseconds, milliseconds, etc. —must musical or poetical bars be equal? In other words, within what limits do they seem sufficiently equal to the ear? Mr Rudmose-Brown

[1] The size of the 'differential time-limen' increases with the length of the intervals (see *Psychological Review*, XVIII, 1911, pp. 118—119).

neither knows nor apparently cares to know. Quoting the durations I have calculated for the bars of four lines[1]—

Sh*ow* me f*air* would sc*orn* to sp*y*—
57·4 62·5 61·0
Close on the h*ou*nds the h*u*nter c*a*me—
50·4 49·5 45·6
M*ou*ntain and me*a*dow, m*o*ss and m*oo*r—
59·4 49·1 46·0
P*e*nnons and fl*a*gs def*a*ced and st*ai*ned—
68·1 53·1 64·4

he humorously remarks: "The isochronism is not obvious to my prejudiced mind" (p. 239). Whether obvious or not to his mind, he knows. But to his ear? He does not know. This he can only find by long, minute, and scrupulous experiments, which, of course, is much more troublesome than the off-hand statement of an arbitrary opinion. Now, even if the actual bars, with their ever-changing sound-complexes, were replaced by "accentual trochees" consisting of identical sounds—identical with regard to pitch and 'timbre'—namely those of a tuning-fork, no human ear could detect any difference of duration between the bars in each of the first two lines; and the bars of the last two—though somewhat unequal to an ear on its guard—would satisfy the demands of rhythmic isochronism. This is shown by what in experimental psychology, as well as in any other science, is called the 'relative variation' (*v. v.*): in hundredths of the 'unit' or uniform duration to which the bars of each line tend more or less approximately—i.e. their mean—their average difference from that unit is respectively 3·2, 3·9, 10·3 and 9·4, with an average of 6·7 for the four lines; according to experiments made by Mr J. E. Wallace Wallin with a tuning-fork, the differential limen is on an average 5·2 for mere difference of time (duration), 6·36 for "excellent," 8·53 for "good," 12·0 for "fairly good," 14·5 for "poor," and 17·8 for "disrupted" rhythm (*Psychological Review*, XVIII, 1911, p. 107). From the fact that the rhythm improves in quality together with the approximation to absolute isochronism, we may infer that isochronism is the 'limit' to which rhythm tends, i.e. the principle of rhythm. But our own rhythm, by which we measure the intervals of objective rhythm, automatically adapts itself to their variations, which we therefore fail to perceive directly as such, though the spontaneous effort of adjustment is felt in proportion to their extent—hence those different qualities of rhythm—till a maximum is reached where adaptation becomes impossible, or at least too great a strain, and the objective rhythm accordingly for us ceases to exist. Within what limits—certainly wider ones—would all this happen when we hear the actual bars? I do not know[2]. I therefore thought it best to compare poetical with

[1] The duration of each complete bar is indicated in centiseconds under its beginning. I beg the reader to remember that I measure the bars from beat to beat (italics).

[2] I am sorry I have not been able to procure Mr Wallin's *Researches on the Rhythm of Speech* (Studies from the Yale Psychological Laboratory, IX, 1911). As I do not know the conditions of the experiments, though I suppose they also were somewhat artificial, I cannot avail myself of the results, which he briefly sums up in the article first mentioned

musical bars, which latter are acknowledged to be isochronous, and—as Mr Rudmose-Brown quotes with a sneer ("possibly")—I observed that our four lines are on an average "tout aussi près de l'isochronisme que les plus régulières de mes chansons" (p. 239). Is this going too far?

Mr Rudmose-Brown skips over the lines in which the bars come nearest to absolute isochronism. He continually gibes at Mr La. and Mr Le., whose competence or incompetence he can only guess at, but never even mentions Mme Duclaux (Mary Robinson), whom he can hardly charge with not caring for verse or not knowing how to read her own. However, let that be. We will only consider the examples he alludes to. Most of them were read by Mr La., who assuredly "est philologue et s'occupe plus de grammaire que de poésie" (III, p. 214), but none the less *does* enjoy poetry. As an instance of 'iambic' verse, with real rising rhythm, I had chosen

And pass his days in peace among his own.

In order to get a complete sentence, I replaced 'and pass' by 'he passed.' As 'his own' could not be easily measured on the tracing, Mr La. suggested 'his sheep' instead, "non sans rire, et il récita sans grand enthousiasme, comme il me le dit sur le coup, ce vers que le poète eût pris pour une parodie irrévérencieuse" (III, p. 259):

He passed his days in peace among his sheep.—
59 58 43 45

The rendering I have—perhaps wrongly—assumed to be rather bad. So too, very likely, was Mr Le.'s rendering of

Enoch was host one day, Philip the next.—
85 85 60 67

Nevertheless the bars in each hemistich, or rather section, of the two lines are as equal as can be expected: 59 and 58, 43 and 45; 85 and 85, 60 and 67. That the tempo often changes after a pause, in song as in verse, is a well-known fact[1]. Has Mr Rudmose-Brown never met, in the middle of a piece of music, with such words as 'accelerando' (i.e. gradually increasing the speed of the movement) or 'affrettando' (i.e. hastening the time)? Here we have an 'affrettando.' Does it, as is often the case, break rhythmic continuity? Or does it not? In other words, is there still (unconsciously) in the reader's mind and for the listener's ear some tendency to an approximate equality of the four bars? The relative variation is not so great as to forbid our thinking so: 14·1 (La.) and 14·4 (Le.). I can also infer it from a notation which I chiefly use in order to "comparer directement la régularité des vers à celle du chant" (III, p. 109). As the bars in different lines or musical phrases are of different lengths, they cannot be compared directly, with

(p. 100). See Verrier, *L'Isochronisme en Musique et en Poésie* (*Journal de Psychologie*, 1912, ii).

[1] See e.g. *L'isochronisme dans le vers français*, ex. VIII and 34.

respect to isochronism, unless they are expressed in function of their unit, or mean. Which gives in the case of our two lines:

La.	1·15	1·14	0·85	0·88,
Le.	1·15	1·15	0·81	0·90.

With regard to the first one, as these figures can reasonably be reduced in round numbers to 1 for each bar, I observed that "cet isochronisme n'est pas aussi loin d'être atteint qu'on se l'imagine en lisant les nombres du tableau ci-dessus" (III, p. 261), i.e. 59, 58, 43, 45 cs. Is this, again, going too far? Mr Rudmose-Brown concludes: "I must protest that the series 59, 58, 43, 45 cs....cannot, by any conceivable process consistent with scientific accuracy[,] be reduced...to 1, 1, 1, 1. The same applies to the line

He sent abroad a shrill and terrible cry,

which, read by Mr La., gave 53, 60, 51, 59 cs., reduced unblushingly by M. Verrier to 1, 1, 1, 1" (p. 240). Here, again, I did nothing of the kind. But the bars, in function of their unit, or mean, are represented by 0·95, 1·07, 0·91, 1·05, which, in round numbers, undoubtedly gives 1, 1, 1, 1. And with regard to their impression on the hearer, they *are* isochronous (*r. v.* = 6·7). Still more so are the double bars, or dipodies: 113 and 110 cs. (*r. v.* = 1·4).

The same applies to this other line, about which Mr Rudmose-Brown also quarrels with me:

Dark as a funeral scarf from stem to stern.—

La.	67	65	74	64	(III, p. 261).
		r. v.=4·8.			
		r. v. of the double bars (132 and 138 cs.)=2·2.			
Le.	80	77	77	70	(III, p. 264).
		r. v.=3·9.			

Judging by Mr Wallin's differential time-limen (5·2), it must be admitted that the bars (and double bars) would have been perceived, by any listener and under any conditions, as perfectly equal. Even the most regular music seldom comes nearer, or indeed as near, to absolute isochronism. But I am afraid Mr Rudmose-Brown will still "fail to see how isochronism can be inferred" (p. 240).

On p. 232 he says: "M. Verrier...would have spent his space more profitably in clarifying the expression of his own ideas than in abusing his predecessors in metric research. E.g. a long list of metrists including Mr Omond, Mr Thomson and Professor Lewis are (p. 145, note) deficient in "une connaissance suffisante du rythme en général, de la phonétique, de la physiopsychologie et [a misprint, read 'ou'] de l'histoire de la versification anglaise." In this very passage I quoted these English metrists as witnesses to the isochronism I myself advocated. How could I have been so foolish as to disparage the authority of men to whose evidence I appealed. That they, however, have left something for others to do I must assume, or else I should not have taken the trouble to write three big volumes. Why they have done so, I tried to explain by presuming that "il a manqué à tous ces auteurs,

pour appliquer exactement le principe de l'isochronisme [here in italics], une connaissance suffisante de" etc., i.e. of some science or other which at first sight may seem so remote from modern English metric that many metrists treat it as an almost superfluous "preliminary" or even pride themselves on ignoring it, e.g. phonetics. Is this abuse? Mr Rudmose-Brown is particularly unlucky in picking out Mr Omond, whose books I praised as "remarquables," "[du] plus grand intérêt" and "si instructifs" (I, p. 144), Mr William Thomson and Professor Lewis, of whom I said that "[ils] se rapprochent pourtant de la vérité sur presque tous les points importants" (I, p. 145, note 1)—and that too in the very passage he quotes as an instance of my abuse.

One last curious mistake I must mention. I have a record of the well-known line:

A wet sheet and a flowing sea.

As to force, or intensity, all I can gather from the tracing is that 'wet' is at least as strong as 'sheet,' 'sheet' a good deal stronger than 'and,' 'and' at least as strong as 'a,' etc. This accentuation agrees with either of the two possible rhythms:

A. A wet sheet *a*nd a flo*w*ing se*a*,—
B. A wet sh*ee*t and a flo*w*ing se*a*.—

So far I was quite at a loss to decide which was (consciously or unconsciously) adopted. But the principle of isochronism allowed me to solve the difficulty. Suppose that in a piece of music, through a misprint, there seems to be in *two* places some trace of the 'bar'—i.e. the perpendicular line—which should precede the second beat and indicate the beginning of the second measure: in order to discover which of the two is the right one, you only have to add up the values of the notes before and after each of them, so as to see in which case you get two regular measures. In the same way I was enabled to find out the actual rhythm by trying whether each of the groups '(w)et sheet' and 'and a fl(owing)' or '(w)et sh(eet)' and '(sh)eet and a fl(owing)' occupies the time of a bar. I therefore added up the durations of the rhythmic syllables[1], first according to *A* and then according to *B*, in order to ascertain which scansion gives isochronous bars—at least, the more isochronous bars—i.e. which fits my subject's rendering of the line (III, pp. 243—249). Both operations, of course, with the numbers calculated from the same record. "The same record!" Mr Rudmose-Brown exclaims. "A fresh reading and a fresh record were surely necessary. Nothing whatever is proved except M. Verrier's want of scientific method and common sense" (p. 240). Mr Rudmose-Brown is very kind. As he does not understand my way of proceeding, I will illustrate it by a familiar comparison. I hope I shall not offend him by

[1] By 'rhythmic syllable' I mean the interval between two "syllabic onsets" (Wm Thomson, *Rhythm and Scansion*, pp. 3 and 4), i.e. from the beginning of a syllabic sound (generally a vowel) to the beginning of the next one. See Verrier, *La Mesure des durées rythmiques* (*Revue de Phonétique*, 1912).

suggesting that he sometimes buys a hat. When he sees the hatter bring him a couple, in order to try them on, I wonder whether he exclaims in the same genial tone: "Two hats! And of a different size! Do you think I have got two heads? I admire your want of common sense." The hatter might reply: "Two heads? I'm afraid you have not got one." This, of course, would also be extremely rude. But what could Mr Rudmose-Brown retort? I cannot guess. In any case the hatter would very likely decline to discuss any further.

So do I.

PAUL VERRIER.

PARIS.

REVIEWS.

L'exotisme américain dans la littérature française au XVI^e *siècle.* By GILBERT CHINARD. Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1911. 8vo. xvii + 246 pp.

M. Chinard, who is Maître de Conferences at Brown University, Providence, has chosen an interesting as well as an appropriate subject, and has treated it in an interesting fashion. That subject is the influence of the discovery and conquest of America on French Literature in the sixteenth century. Of his ten chapters five (I, II, IV, VI, VII) deal with the discoveries themselves and the narratives relating to them, while the remaining five are concerned with the influence of these discoveries on ideas and literature. The chief writers who come under M. Chinard's survey are Rabelais (c. III), Ronsard (c. V) and Montaigne (c. IX). Rabelais's sources are never very easy to detect, they are so various, so haphazard, so unexpected. You may be hot on a literary trail, when you are suddenly checked by what another investigator convincingly shews to be a personal reminiscence. You come upon what evidently seems a personal touch, and it turns out to be a translation from some contemporary Latin writer. It may be said, however, as a general rule that when Rabelais borrows he does it unblushingly, and without any attempt to cover up his tracks. For that reason it seems to me that M. Chinard's quest into Rabelais's geographical sources has not led to results which are sufficiently precise to be convincing. He would doubtless have modified his chapter if he had known that one source at any rate is certain, viz. the *Novus Orbis* of Simon Grynaeus. This volume contains among many other pieces a Latin version (at fifth hand) of the Travels of Marco Polo and a summary of Peter Martyr's Fourth Decade, both of which writers M. Chinard believes to have been used by Rabelais[1]. I am glad to see that he contemplates a special study of the influence of Marco Polo, which he thinks is considerable. I cannot say that I have found much trace of him. I had thought indeed that Rabelais's unicorn (V, 29) owed something to his rhinoceros, until Mr W. F. Smith pointed out to me that it comes straight out of Pliny.

As regards the influence of Jacques Cartier's narrative we seem to be pretty much in agreement, though personally, since M. Lefranc's

[1] *Modern Language Review*, II, 316 ff.

discovery of the real Jamet Brayer I have become sceptical as to the identification of Rabelais's pilot with the Breton seaman. A still graver doubt would seem to rest on the identification of Xenomanes with Jean-Alfonse of Saintonge, first proposed by Pierre Margry, for M. Sainéan has recently shewn that his *Cosmographie*, which the *Hydrographie* deposited by Xenomanes with Gargantua was supposed to represent, is nothing but a defective translation of the *Suma de geografia* of Fernandez de Enciso (Seville, 1519)[1]. It does not, however, follow that Jean-Alfonse, because he was an ignorant and dishonest writer, was not a capable navigator. In fact what we know about him shews that he was. He may still therefore be meant by Xenomanes, and he may still have written or left notes for an *Hydrographie* of which Rabelais had heard, but which is now lost. But it is also possible, and it would be quite in accordance with Rabelais's fantastic humour, that Xenomanes represents somebody who was not a pilot at all.

In the last words of his chapter on Rabelais M. Chinard couples Mandeville and Marco Polo as adventurous and imaginative travellers. This is unjust to Marco Polo, whose narrative is generally regarded as a tolerably faithful record of what he saw, though, in accordance with a common practice of travellers which was still honoured in the sixteenth century, he inserted information which he had got from hearsay or *ouy dire*. That surely is the point of Rabelais's satire in the chapter on the Country of Satin which has disconcerted M. Chinard. Why, he asks, does Rabelais, who had such confidence in Cartier that he made him Pantagruel's pilot, put him among writers who wrote *par ouy dire*? There are only two ways, he says, out of the difficulty. Either Jamet Brayer is not Jacques Cartier or the chapter is not by Rabelais. I thoroughly agree with him in rejecting the latter alternative, but though I contemplate the first alternative without a pang, there is yet a third alternative, namely, that Rabelais while believing in Cartier's skill as a navigator and in his general trustworthiness as a narrator, ventured to doubt whether all his information was the result of first-hand observation.

If M. Chinard then has not definitely added to our knowledge of Rabelais's geographical sources, he has at any rate written an interesting and suggestive chapter, and he has done well in laying emphasis on Rabelais's attitude to mediæval traditions. It is just because of the mixture in Rabelais of the mediæval spirit with that of the Renaissance that he is so complete a representative of his age.

On the other hand as regards Montaigne, M. Chinard has made a real addition to his known sources. He shews that passages in his essay *On Cannibals* (I, xxx) are borrowed, sometimes without the alteration of a word, from a translation of Girolamo Benzoni's *Historia del Mondo nuovo* (Venice, 1565), made by Urbain Chauveton, a zealous Protestant. Benzoni, a Milanese, who had spent fourteen years in America, judged the conduct of the Spaniards with great severity, and

[1] *Rev. des études rabelaisiennes*, x (1912), 19 ff.

Chauveton supplemented his translation with a *Brief discours* of his own on the massacre of the French Protestants in Florida. M. Chinard analyses this pamphlet at some length in his seventh chapter, and praises it highly for its literary qualities. As its date is 1579, it follows that the opening part of Montaigne's essay *On Cannibals* was written in that year as the earliest, and therefore not long before the publication of his *Essays* in 1580. Another possible source, according to M. Chinard, for this essay is Jean Léry, a gentleman of Burgundy, who published in 1578 an account of Villegagnon's expedition to Brazil.

The other essay of Montaigne's which is largely concerned with the New World is that *On Coaches*, written probably in 1586 or 1587. M. Chinard well points out the difference in tone between the two essays. While the earlier one is inspired by the writer's curiosity and love of humorous paradox, the later one is eloquent with sympathy for the unfortunate inhabitants of Mexico and Peru, and with indignation against their Spanish conquerors. 'We are so accustomed,' says M. Chinard, 'to see in Montaigne the sceptic, that we too often forget that he was a man, and that he sometimes steeped his lips in the milk of human kindness.' I read this remark with pleasure, for it shews that M. Chinard's eyes have been opened to the error of the view that Montaigne is a pure sceptic, and that he could not be eloquent on behalf of virtue and things of good repute. Interesting, too, is the suggestion that between the first publication of the *Essays*, and that of 1588, Montaigne had progressed in a moral sense, 'that his conception of the world had been enlarged, and that he had become really better.' This is just the opposite to M. Strowski's view. But here I must reluctantly leave M. Chinard; there are many other interesting things in his book, but space forbids me to notice them.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

Herder als Faust. Eine Untersuchung. Von GÜNTHER JACOBY. Leipzig: Felix Meiner. 1911. 8vo. xii + 485 pp.

Günther Jacoby, dem wir eine sehr förderliche, wenn auch etwas breit gehaltene Untersuchung und Bewertung der ästhetischen Lebensarbeit Herders und ihrer Berechtigung gegenüber den Anschauungen Kants verdanken[1], versucht sich hier auf dem Gebiete der Literaturgeschichte. Leider mit wenig Erfolg. Was er in seinen ermüdend breiten, mit Wiederholungen übersättigten und oft in deklamatorischem Stil gehaltenen Ausführungen zu beweisen sucht, ist die Behauptung 'dass Herder Goethes Faust ist, und zwar der Faust des ersten Teiles bis zum Auftritt im Auerbachkeller.' Es sollen also nicht bloss Züge von Herders Charakter, Anschauungen von ihm verwertet sein (womit die Forschung längst rechnete), sondern Herder, der mit Goethe in Strassburg

[1] G. Jacoby, *Herders und Kants Aesthetik.* Im gleichen Verlage, 1907.

verkehrte, soll Faust selber sein; freilich nicht der empirische Herder mit seinen tausend kleinen Schwächen, sondern 'das geheimnisvolle, übermenschliche Bild Herders,' das Goethe von 'seinem Abgott' entworfen hatte. Und wie führt Jacoby seinen Beweis? Nicht, indem er mit der Sonde der modernen Individualpsychologie in die Tiefe der Persönlichkeit Herders hineinfährt und uns zeigt, dass Goethe in Faust einen Charakter von der gleichen seelischen Struktur, von demselben emotionellen Typus, von gleicher Stärke und Richtung des Willenslebens, von gleichem (nicht nur gelegentlich ähnlichem) äusseren und vor allem inneren Entwicklungsgange dargestellt habe—sondern durch eine massenhafte Anhäufung von Parallelen, die er mit grossem Fleisse, aber auch mit einseitiger Beschränkung auf Herders Schriften und ohne eine wirklich umfassende Kenntnis der Literatur des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts zusammengetragen hat! Hätten wir in Faust wirklich einen Menschen von der gleichen Art und Bildung wie Herder vor uns, warum sollte dann die psychologische Identität nicht über die Auerbachszene hinausreichen? Aber nicht einmal bis zur Auerbachszene will Jacoby sie ausdehnen. Hören wir die wunderlichen Programmsätze auf S. 49: 'Wir wenden uns nunmehr zu jenen Gestalten, die in jenen Auftritten des Faust erscheinen. Es sind stets zwei. Auf der einen Seite der von unbefriedigtem Wissensdurst zerrissene, den tatsächlichen Befund der einzelnen Wissenschaften verachtende, zu weltfrischem Leben sich hingedrängt fühlende Gelehrte, der das Tiefste erkennen will und nur erkennt, dass wir nichts wissen. Faust und Mephisto teilen sich in diese Rolle. Auf der andern Seite der harmlose, von der Macht der Wissenschaft überzeugte Jüngling: Famulus Wagner als künftiger Stubengelehrter und der junge Schüler; hier und da endlich Faust selbst Mephisto gegenüber. Immer diese beiden Gestalten. Es wäre zu weit gegriffen, wenn wir behaupten wollten: der unbefriedigte, spottende und verachtende Gelehrte sei schlechthin Herder. Es wäre falsch, Goethe und den wissenschaftsgläubigen Jüngling für ein und dasselbe zu halten. Weder deckt sich Herder schlechthin mit Faust und Mephisto, noch deckt sich Goethe auch nur annähernd mit Wagner und dem Schüler' usw. Damit ist für den psychologisch geschulten Leser das Buch bereits gerichtet. Eine Persönlichkeit ist ein geschlossener Organismus und lässt sich in dieser Weise nicht auf verschiedene dramatische Charaktere verteilen, ohne dass die Einheit darüber zugrunde ginge. Dass ein dramatischer Charakter Züge von einer lebenden Persönlichkeit hat und dass Faust solche Züge mit Herder teilt, wussten wir immer. Dass aber Faust Herder sei, davon kann keine Rede sein.

So beschränkt sich der Ertrag des umfangreichen Buches auf die beigebrachten Parallelen zwischen Herders Schriften und Goethes Text. Leider fehlt dem Verfasser auch hier die philologische Schulung; er weiss wohl, dass einige Szenen des Faust früher gedichtet sind, als andere, aber von einer bewussten, methodischen, durchgehenden Scheidung der alten und neuen Schichten, von einer vorsichtigen Datierung herangezogener Gedichte Herders ist kaum die Spur zu

finden[1]. So werden diese Parallelen im einzelnen immer wieder einer sorgfältigen Nachprüfung bedürfen, wie wir sie hier nicht anstellen können. Hinderlich für die Benutzung des Buches ist der Umstand, dass Jacoby die wichtigste Faustliteratur wohl in der Einleitung nennt, im einzelnen aber nicht zitiert und der Leser somit nicht ohne weiteres überblickt, wie viel ihm z. B. die ausserordentlich förderliche Studie Collins über den 'Urfaust' vorgearbeitet hatte. Andererseits aber sind ihm so unentbehrliche Vorarbeiten wie Bouckes treffliches Buch[2] unbekannt; sonst hätte er Herders dynamistische Lehre von der Kontrarietät in einen viel weiteren Zusammenhang rücken und damit für die Erklärung auch des Faust ganz anders fruchtbar machen können. Immerhin steckt in den vergleichenden Abschnitten Jacobys reiches und wertvolles Material, das, mit der nötigen Kritik benutzt, die Forschung befruchten kann. Die historische Interpretation freilich erfährt wenig Förderung. Mich wenigstens kann Jacobys Hypothese nicht überzeugen, dass Herder genauere Kenntnis von Lessings Faustplänen mit nach Strassburg gebracht habe und dadurch Goethe zu seiner Dichtung angeregt worden sei, in der dann Lessing eine Art unerlaubter Konkurrenz gesehen hätte. Und für den grossen Läuterungsprozess, der sich in der dramatischen Handlung des zweiten Teils aus dem steten Ineinanderwirken der zwei Seelen in Faust ergibt, hat Jacoby kein Verständnis. 'Statt Gefühl und Sinnlichkeit in gegenseitiger Einschränkung wirken zu lassen, stürzt Faust von einer Vereinzelung seiner Seelenkräfte zu der anderen. Er stürzt von Sünde zu Sünde.' (Und das soll dann das Ebenbild Herders sein!) 'Das Ende des zweiten Teils in Goethes Faust bringt, unvermutet und abgebrochen, fast möchte man sagen: unbegründet, die im himmlischen Vorspiel verheissene Lösung." Sapienti sat!

ROBERT PETSCH.

LIVERPOOL.

The Lay of the Nibelung Men. Translated from the Old German text by ARTHUR S. WAY. Cambridge: University Press. 1911. Large 8vo. xxi + 325 pp.

Mr Way's translation is the ninth attempt that has been made to reproduce the *Nibelungenlied* in English. It may be said at once that from the artistic point of view he has surpassed all his predecessors. There are, it is true, metrically unsatisfactory lines which have to be read more than once before the position of the caesura and the incidence of the stress become clear; the rime, though generally good, is sometimes treated rather freely (*he*: *triumphantly*; *blood*: *good*; *lord*: *word*;

[1] Den philologischen Leser wird es belustigen, zu hören, dass der 'erhabene Geist' in der Szene 'Wald und Höhle' und der Geist, den Faust in der Szene 'Trüber Tag, Feld' anredet, ein anderer als der Erdgeist ist und zwar der 'Makrokosmus,' der Weltgeist im Grossen, dessen Zeichen Faust in der ersten Szene erblickt.

[2] E. A. Boucke, *Goethes Weltanschauung auf historischer Grundlage.* Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der dynamischen Denkrichtung und Gegensatzlehre. Stuttgart, Frommann, 1907.

misery: *lie*; etc.); and the translator's fondness for forceful language occasionally produces expressions that are hardly happy ('the feastful board,' p. 2; 'Siegfried's limbs at the death-stab leapt convulsively,' p. 133; 'No battle-blencher was Etzel,' p. 276). But in spite of these occasional blemishes it must be granted that Mr Way has caught something of the spirit of William Morris, whose *Story of Sigurd the Völsung and the Fall of the Niblungs* has served as his model so far as the metrical form—and apparently also the style—is concerned. And as none of the previous translations, unfortunately, can honestly be described as maintaining a really high poetic level, we have here a distinct advance, for which Mr Way deserves our congratulations and thanks.

Regarded merely as a translation, however, Mr Way's work is more open to criticism. His adoption of the epic metre used by William Morris (couplets of six feet in irregular ascending rhythm with feminine caesura and masculine rime) in place of the Nibelungen stanza may be entirely justified, and is, as a matter of fact, no great departure from the metre of the original; but of the style of the *Nibelungenlied* there is in this translation hardly a trace. One of the most striking characteristics of the medieval German epic is its simplicity of both thought and expression, its naturalness, its lack of embellishment. One of the most striking characteristics of Mr Way's translation is its wealth of metaphors, of superlatives, of sonorous phrases, of bold compounds and combinations. '*Von küener recken strîten*' becomes: 'Of the thunder of war-waves clashing'; '*daz in allen landen niht schœners mohte sîn*'—'Though ye searched, ye should find none fairer to the uttermost ends of the earth'; '*Kriemhilt geheizen; si wart ein scœne wîp*'—'And her name far-sung was Kriemhild, she was sweeter than speech may tell'; '*Der minneclîchen meide triuten wol gezam. ir muotten küene recken, niemen was ir gram*'—'There was no man whose pride had warded his breast against love's dart | Shot from the eyes victorious, from the snare of many a heart'; all from the first three stanzas—and so on almost indefinitely. Mr Way's translation is, in fact, consistently, on page after page, more emphatic and more consciously beautiful and poetic than his original. But for that very reason he fails to reproduce the original, and an English reader cannot but receive a very misleading impression of the style and even the spirit of the German poem. The *Nibelungenlied* is, in Schiller's language, 'naiv'; Mr Way's muse is 'sentimentalisch.' The *Nibelungenlied* is typical medieval 'Volkspoesie'; Mr Way's translation reminds one rather of that type of modern 'Kunstpoesie' which corresponds to the pre-Raphaelite school of painting.

In view of Mr Way's repute as a classical scholar and translator of Greek epic and dramatic literature we naturally expect his translation of the *Nibelungenlied* to be above the average in scholarly accuracy. So far as can be judged by a comparison of various portions of his often rather free rendering with the M.H.G. text this is actually the case. He has avoided most of the numerous mistranslations that mar the

work of nearly all his predecessors—Professor G. H. Needler's is the one thoroughly scholarly translation yet published—though he has not escaped *all* the pitfalls that beset the unwary translator from medieval German. To mention a few examples: '*drîe künege edel unde rîch*'—'Three highborn Kings and *wealthy*' (p. 7); '*milde*'—'of *courtesy* the crown' (p. 1), 'Lady of *Courtesy*' (p. 57), but correctly 'open-handed' (p. 70); '*wie liebe mit leide ze iungest lônen kan*'—'How *love* hath sorrow for guerdon, etc.' (p. 3); '*sô sêre zurnde der wunde, des gie im wærlîchen nôt*'—'*Maddened him now that death-wound, a very torment of pain*' (p. 133). The first three are typical of nearly all translations from medieval German, most translators falling into the mistake of giving the modern meaning to these and other words whose meaning has changed considerably—an important matter in some cases, such as *liep, liebe,* and *lieben.* In the last example Mr Way has either overlooked the gender of *wunde* and misunderstood the idiomatic use of *gie im nôt,* or deliberately substituted his own thought. His original quite characteristically hardly so much as hints at physical pain throughout the whole description of Siegfried's death.

In conclusion, lest blame should appear to outweigh well-deserved praise, Mr Way's translation of the rather difficult lines in which Etzel describes with grim humour the warrior-minstrel Volker may be quoted:

> Within there fighteth a warrior, Volker, a name of dread.
> Like some wild boar he rageth—and a minstrel him they name!
> Thank Heaven that safe from the talons of this foul fiend I came!
> Doom rings and sings in his measures, red are the strokes of his bow;
> In his notes I hear the death-knell of many a knight laid low.
> What hath the viol-minstrel against us know I not.
> Never by guest such sorrow upon mine house was brought!

Here, and in many other passages like it, we have something like the real *Nibelungenlied.*

F. E. Sandbach.

Birmingham.

Historical Manual of English Prosody. By George Saintsbury. London: Macmillan. 1910. 8vo. xvii + 347 pp.

It may at once be said that Professor Saintsbury's *Manual* is the most useful book of the kind that we have. It has the great merit of being readable as well as instructive; and though we may find some incompleteness and regret some perversities of expression, the exposition and illustration of principles is sufficiently sound so far as it goes, and the historical survey of English poets and English prosodists contains an immense amount of useful information in a comparatively small space.

After some preliminary skirmishing with supposed opponents, which in such a book as this might perhaps have been spared, we arrive at a full statement of the author's system of scansion, on the 'foot' system,

with a long and interesting chapter of illustrations, in which the selection of passages is for the most part admirable. This constitutes the First Book. Then comes as Book II a historical account of the development of English verse from the origins to the present time, and this is followed by an outline of the history of prosodical theory. Book IV consists of 'auxiliary apparatus,' a very full explanatory glossary of terms, a list of English poets in alphabetical order, with short appreciations of their prosodic quality and influence, a brief chapter on the origins of the most important forms of line and stanza, and finally a useful bibliography.

We have here a far more systematic treatment of the subject than in the author's *History of English Prosody*, which suffered much for want of clear statement of principles and definition of terms. The confusion between length and stress, which is so disturbing a feature in the larger book, is evidently less misleading when we are clearly told that the 'length' of a syllable does not really mean its length in the ordinary sense of the word, that is the time which it takes to pronounce, but something quite different. At the same time it is to be regretted that Professor Saintsbury should use the terms 'long' and 'short' in the way he does, partly because such use is seriously misleading, in spite of explanation, and more because the terms are wanted for other purposes. Presumably Professor Saintsbury's object in using these particular terms in this manner is to justify the application of classical names to English feet. Such application is no doubt convenient, but it has in any case to be remembered that it is made by virtue not of identity but of analogy, and the analogy holds good whether the syllables are called 'long' and 'short' or stressed and unstressed. Probably 'strong' and 'weak' would meet the case as well as any other nomenclature, it being understood of course that a foot may on occasion consist of two strong syllables (the spondee) or of two weak syllables (the pyrrhic). The mischief of Professor Saintsbury's terminology is that it tends to put out of sight the part which is played in English verse by actual length of syllable, either in combination with stress, in which case it is one of the elements of strength, or apart from it, giving many subtle variations of rhythm which apparently quite escape Professor Saintsbury's attention.

We must also note that though a full account is given of the various feet which are admissible in English verse, little or nothing is said in the 'rules' about the way in which they are combined. Surely in a manual of prosody we ought to be told something about the extent to which trochaic substitution, for example, can be used in iambic verse, and the conditions of its use; and again something might with advantage have been said about the use of the pyrrhic, the foot which has no element of length or stress, but obtains its metrical value from the reader's conscious or unconscious acceptance of the normal rhythm, and is either compensated by a neighbouring spondee, as in

> Left him at large *to his* own dark designs,

or serves to concentrate emphasis on one or more of the other elements of the line, as in

> Rapt in the fear *and in* the wonder of it.

Professor Saintsbury's suggestion that such a combination obtains its value as a foot because one of its syllables, though not long; is capable of being lengthened, is really unworthy of him. No good reader of verse would ever dwell on such a foot, and if he did so he would ruin the intended effect. We suspect that in this matter of the pyrrhic foot lies the key to much that has puzzled English prosodists.

A few criticisms of detail suggest themselves. (1) To illustrate the verse of the Old English period Professor Saintsbury quotes nine lines only (p. 37), and these contain altogether no less than five serious misprints. (2) The theory that Chaucer mingled alexandrines with his five measure verse is much too hastily thrown out. It is certain that such a line as

> And kepeth in semblant alle his observaunces

cannot possibly be an alexandrine. (3) It is a pity that Professor Saintsbury should be content to accept the usual indiscriminate condemnation of the verse of *Gorboduc*. It ought rather to have been his delight to shew what admirable examples of blank verse are afforded by the Sackville portions of that interesting tragedy, instead of culling a commonplace instance of rudimentary stiffness from Norton (p. 63). Surely it is worth while to note that such blank verse as the following was produced on the English stage as early as 1561:

> We then, alas, the ladies which that time
> Did there attend, seeing that heinous deed,
> And hearing him oft call the wretched name
> Of mother, and to cry to her for aid,
> Whose direful hand gave him the mortal wound,
> Pitying, alas, (for nought else could we do)
> His ruthful end, ran to the woeful bed,
> Despoiled straight his breast, and all we might,
> Wiped in vain with napkins next at hand
> The sudden streams of blood that flushed fast
> Out of the gaping wound. O what a look,
> O what a ruthful steadfast eye methought
> He fix'd upon my face, which to my death
> Will never part from me, when with a braid
> A deep-fetch'd sigh he gave, and therewithal
> Clasping his hands to heaven he cast his sight.

This is not an example of 'extreme stiffness and "single-mouldedness" in the lines.' On the contrary, in freedom it compares favourably with most of Marlowe's verse, and yet it was written at least six and twenty years earlier than *Tamburlaine*.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

The English Provincial Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders to 1557. By E. Gordon Duff. (The Sandars Lectures, 1911.) Cambridge: University Press. 1912. 8vo. x + 153 pp.

In these Lectures Mr Duff supplements those which he delivered in 1899 and 1904, dealing with the printers, stationers and bookbinders of Westminster and London from 1476 to 1535. The terminal date chosen for the present series is fixed by the year in which the charter was granted to the re-formed Company of Stationers, containing a clause which virtually put an end to provincial printing. With the exception of a few books, Mr Duff says, printed under a special privilege at Norwich between 1566 and 1579, and a doubtful York book of 1579, no book was printed outside London until 1584–5, when the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford once more started their presses. Within the period chosen, printing was exercised in ten towns, and the presses fall roughly into three groups. The first contains Oxford, St Alban's, and York, the second Oxford's revived press, Cambridge, Tavistock, Abingdon, and the second St Alban's press, and the last group Ipswich, Worcester, and Canterbury. Besides these there are the books printed for Hereford and Exeter, and the books with false or misleading imprints, such as Winchester and Greenwich.

The number of books with which Mr Duff treats in these lectures is surprisingly small. Only one hundred and thirty-two books are at present known to have been issued by the English Provincial presses between 1478 and 1556, and it is doubtful if many more remain to be discovered. The difficulties moreover connected with the subject are considerable, for to the books not known from actual inspection must be added the books which have disappeared, books, as Ames would have said, which are asleep. Very slowly, in spite of the remarkable growth in the study of the subject which the last quarter of a century has witnessed, does fresh information come to light. Mr Duff announces one new St Alban's book. He records Mr A. G. Murray's important discovery in connexion with the Ipswich edition of Bale's *Scriptores*, and he notes all work done upon the subject, thus duly recording Mr F. E. M. Beck's paper on the *Plaister for a galled horse*. The bibliography at the end of the book is important and exhaustive. Not the least charm of these lectures lies in the delightful modesty with which Mr Duff relates, or rather conceals, his own discoveries. From the words themselves the fortunate hunter could not be identified. The humour of the writer deserves a passing tribute.

A very valuable Appendix gives a list of all the books from these provincial presses, known or recorded, with a statement as to the present locality of all copies known. The index is not quite perfect. Mr Duff's final paragraph deserves attention:

> Perhaps what may have struck you most is how much we have yet to learn on the subject, how little we really know. A good deal of what has been said has been, not about books which we possess, but about books which we have lost. A cloud

of obscurity still hangs over the subject, but the cloud has a silver lining. Think how much there still remains for us to discover.

Any further discoveries can only be made on the lines which Mr Duff has here laid down; and to anyone willing to investigate further this book, small as it is, is indispensable.

CHARLES SAYLE.

CAMBRIDGE.

English Nativity Plays. Edited by SAMUEL B. HEMINGWAY. (Yale Studies in English xxxviii.) New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1909. 8vo. xlviii + 319 pp.

This is a doctoral thesis of a useful type, in which Yale has specialized under the fostering care of Prof. A. S. Cook. Instead of writing 'about it and about,' the ripening student is set down to do a steady bit of textual editing, with introduction and commentary complete. Mr Hemingway's contribution consists of a comparative study of a section of the English miracle-play cycle, covering the episodes known as the Annunciation, the Salutation of Elizabeth, the Suspicion of Joseph (but not, for what seems an inadequate reason, the Purgation of Mary), Augustus and Cyrenius, the Nativity, the Conversion of Octavian and the *Pastores*. The texts brought together are those of the Chester, *Ludus Coventriae*, York and Townley cycles; the Coventry play proper is not included. The Chester text is taken from the Devonshire manuscript, which Mr Hemingway is probably right in thinking the best representative of its group, and on the whole a better version than Harleian MS. 2124, upon which the E.E.T.S. edition is based. For all the plays a careful collation, not only of manuscripts, but also of all important emendations suggested by modern scholars, who have been particularly busy with the York plays, is appended in the form of foot-notes. Mr Hemingway's terminal notes are comprehensive and concern themselves largely with the indication of sources. His introduction gives a good summary of the problems, mostly unsolved, which surround the genesis of the English cycles. He supports the suggested attribution of the Chester plays to Randall Higden by pointing out that two sources used by Higden in the *Polychronicon* are also used in the sixth of the Chester plays. These are the *Supputationes* of Martinus Polonus, from which both writers took the Octavian-Sibyl myth, and the *De Naturis Rerum* of Alexander Neckam, from which both apparently took the Vergilian account of the Temple of Peace. This is a line of investigation which, as Mr Hemingway himself suggests, might with advantage be applied to the rest of the cycle.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

GERRARD'S CROSS.

Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602. Edited by W. W. Greg. (Tudor and Stuart Library.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. lvi + 100 pp.

Like other recent work by Mr Greg, this is an essay in the higher bibliography. The main object of the editor is to study the puzzling interrelations of the 1602 Quarto and the 1623 Folio versions of *The Merry Wives*, with a view to determining the probable conditions under which each text may be supposed to have come into existence, and the extent to which, in each text, the original intention of Shakespeare has been obscured or modified by the working of other agencies. The task is well adapted to his remarkable powers of critical analysis, and his results, expounded in a luminous introduction, and supported by voluminous notes, are always suggestive and sometimes convincing. One would like to see the method applied to all the plays which, like *The Merry Wives*, have reached us in allotropic states; although it must perhaps be said that, elegant as is the *format* of the *Tudor and Stuart Library*, the discussions involved rather markedly call for the accompaniment of a parallel-text edition. Mr Greg defines his own object as an attempt to establish 'what I imagine to be the first quasi-quantitative analysis of the respective responsibility of these three hypothetical persons—reporter, adapter, and reviser—for the divergencies of the extant texts.' The reporter is the person who supplied to the printer, from a garbled memory of what he had heard upon the stage, the 'copy' for the piratical Quarto text. The adapter is the person who shortened and in other ways adapted the author's original manuscript for the purposes of stage representation; and Mr Greg supposes his operations to antedate both texts, and the effect of them to have been comparatively slight. From the adapter he distinguishes the reviser, whom he supposes to have been employed to make deliberate changes, on grounds other than the needs of the actors, in the structure of the play. And in fact he postulates two revisions; one by a hand other than the author's, also antedating both texts, and designed to eliminate the audacious horse-stealing episode, of which a few traces none the less escaped; the other very trifling, carried out by Shakespeare himself, and apparent in the Folio text only. The most interesting section of Mr Greg's analysis is that in which he attempts to identify the personality of the reporter. This rogue he takes to have been none other than the actor who played the part of the Host of the Garter, and he bases his conjecture on a demonstration of the greater accuracy in the Quarto of all those scenes during which the Host was on the stage. This is extremely ingenious. My only hesitation in subscribing to the theory is that one would have expected the actor to have had an actual manuscript in his possession of his own part, with its cues, and therefore to have been able to ensure absolute instead of merely relative accuracy for his own speeches. Mr Greg suggests that he may have 'learned his part imperfectly and

very likely by ear.' But we know that written 'parts' were used by Elizabethan companies, and we do not know, although it may have been the case, that they employed actors who could not read.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

GERRARD'S CROSS.

William Rowley, his 'All's Lost by Lust,' and 'A Shoemaker a Gentleman.' With an Introduction on Rowley's Place in the Drama. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.) By CHARLES WHARTON STORK. 1910. 8vo. 288 pp.

From an educational point of view, it is an excellent plan to edit one or two of an author's best works, accompanying the selection with a general study of his whole output or of the type of literature to which it belongs. To the editor it affords a very varied training, and if well done, the result is a testimony to his all-round ability; and it is presumably for this reason that of late so many of the publications of American Universities in the field of Elizabethan and Jacobean literature have been of this kind. From the point of view of scholarship, however, the plan has much less to recommend it; for not only do such books stand in the way of more exhaustive studies of their subjects and of complete editions of the authors represented, but in themselves, whether because the attainments requisite for good literary history and for scientific editing are by no means always united in the same person, or simply by reason of the editor's divided interests, they are seldom wholly satisfactory. It cannot be said that the present volume is entirely free from the faults of its class.

By far the greater part of Mr Stork's sixty-page Introduction is devoted to a discussion of Rowley's share in nineteen plays of which he is supposed to have been part author, based on the four plays on the title-page of which his name appears alone. This is a careful piece of work and well deserves attention, but it may, I think, be questioned whether investigations of this sort, in which from so little certain work so much is inferred that must be doubtful, are worth while; or rather perhaps whether it is worth while to try to explain in detail how the results are arrived at. Evidence derived from the technique of verse has a certain definiteness which makes it always of value, and when we have a sufficient mass of an author's writings upon which to base our investigations, we may be helped by peculiarities of vocabulary or by unconscious tricks of style; but the broader characteristics of a man's work, though they may become apparent to one who has made long study of him, can seldom be so analysed or reduced to a formula that arguments based upon them can be appreciated by others. To most readers it will, I think, appear that the editor's attributions of authorship rest ultimately on no more than his personal opinion that such and such a character is too real for Heywood, or would have been invested

by Dekker with more poetic charm, or that such and such a pun is of the kind that Rowley might have made, and the like, and in spite of all his careful analysis, against the quality and thoroughness of which there is nothing to be objected, Rowley will remain a personality of the vaguest.

The most useful part of the volume is undoubtedly the reprint of *All's Lost by Lust* and *A Shoemaker a Gentleman*. The text is, on the whole, very conservative. Mr Stork retains the spelling[1], though not the italics, of the quartos; and indeed the only important departure from exact following of the original is in the treatment of line-division, as to which the editor displays some uncertainty. As is often the case in early editions of plays, much that was evidently intended as prose was printed in irregular lines, with capitals, as if verse. When the editor regards a passage as verse he does not hesitate to re-divide the lines according to scansion, but what he considers as prose he somewhat inconsistently leaves in the original lines, contenting himself with removing the capitals. I cannot but think that if he was unwilling to adopt the modern method of arranging verse and prose, it would have been more satisfactory to print line for line with the original throughout. This would certainly have been the easier method, for, as in the case of Fletcher, whose rhythms Mr Stork thinks that Rowley imitated, it is often very difficult to decide where verse ends and prose begins. On pp. 84—5, for example, there seems little more reason for regarding ll. 120—7 as verse than for so regarding ll. 142—6.

The editor's emendations are occasionally superfluous. For example at p. 101, l. 140 and p. 223, l. 39 it was quite unnecessary to change 'of' into 'off' in a conservative text; the first form is well recognized. Again, p. 171, l. 77, 'these' requires no correction; 'corps' was often regarded as a plural. But the only serious error of this kind seems to be the alteration in p. 121, l. 53, of 'my nowne' to 'mine owne.' Surely Mr Stork must have met with this frequent form elsewhere. Lastly at p. 196, l. 50, it may be suggested that 'Thy' of the original should almost certainly be 'By.'

Such passages of the text as I have compared with the quartos seem to be quite free from error, and the text as a whole has evidently been prepared with great care.

The notes do not err on the side of over-elaboration; indeed in certain respects they are decidedly scanty. We should at any rate, I think, have been shown how in *A Shoemaker a Gentleman*, Rowley made use of his source, Deloney's *Gentle Craft*, and have been told, for example, that the last fourteen lines of Act IV are borrowed almost word for word from that work. It is hardly enough to refer in general terms to Lange's reprint of it.

A few remarks on some of the notes may be added:

p. 81, ll. 5—7. *cold as Aquarius...enter into Pisces.* The meaning

[1] In the preface the editor strangely says: '*v* has been substituted for *u* of the older spelling,' but the original editions of the two plays reprinted conform throughout to the modern usage as regards these letters, and also *j*.

of these lines will be apparent to anyone who remembers that the sun is in Aquarius during the coldest part of the year (Jan.—Feb.), and that the next sign which he enters is Pisces.

p. 99, l. 103. When an editor refers to a certain 'well-known passage' of Ovid, he should not proceed to quote it as 'Omnis amator militat.'

p. 108, l. 37. *I'le give thee seed and reasons.* The editor notes that 'the allusion is obscure.' Surely the author is merely referring to the drug wormseed and to raisins, both of which were used as a cure for intestinal worms (for the raisins see Lupton's *Notable Things*, ii, 61). The person addressed has just complained that he has 'a bed of snakes' within him. For the pun on 'raisins' and 'reasons' compare Middleton's *Old Law*, v, i, 597.

p. 113, l. 10. *widows almes.* Nothing to do with 'mite' and 'might,' as the editor suggests, but the name of certain leg-irons used in Newgate: cf. Nashe's *Strange News*, sig. K 4.

p. 220, l. 46. On the words 'Globe of Earth' spoken by Dioclesian, the editor remarks: 'A bad anachronism, if one should be pedantic.' Why? Does he think that in the time of Dioclesian the earth was not known to be a globe?

p. 233, l. 211. *Wiperginie.* Besides being the name of a game, as the editor says, the word was also used as a cant term for a wench, which is obviously the sense required here.

p. 251, l. 173. *my Currier.* Neither a letter-carrier nor a driver, as Mr Stork conjectures, but a leather-dresser. The shoemakers bought their leather on Mondays, as we learn from *The Gentle Craft*, ed. Lange, p. 96.

Lastly it is to be regretted that references are not given in the Glossary. In this respect, as in some others, a comparatively small amount of additional work on the part of the editor would have very greatly increased the value of his book. But Mr Stork has done much, and perhaps we should not complain that he has not done more. We have to thank him for what is on the whole a very careful and satisfactory edition of two interesting plays.

R. B. McKerrow.

London.

The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. (Columbia University Studies in Comparative Literature.) By Samuel Lee Wolff. New York: The Columbia University Press. 1912. 8vo. x + 529 pp.

This is a scholarly, judicious and laborious work, and its conclusions —unlike those of many works of similar character—generally carry conviction. The author has wisely restricted himself to a consideration of the influence of three Greek romances,—Heliodorus' *Æthiopica*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe* —on five English writers of fiction—Lyly, Sidney, Greene, Nashe and

Lodge, only prefacing this investigation by an illuminating analysis of the general and special characteristics of the Greek romances. He shows very clearly how many of those elements of Elizabethan literature which we are apt to look upon as especially anti-classical are already to be found in that late Greek literature which emanated originally from Alexandria. 'It is as if the Greek Romances were "made to order" for the entertainment of the Renaissance. Their authors, like Virgil, "divined what the future would love." Hardly any other kind of fiction, hardly any other view of life, could appeal more strongly to the sixteenth century novel-reader and novel-writer than the ornate, spectacular, rhetorical, sentimental, fortuitous medley which we have been attempting to characterize. The Renaissance, in its uncritical acceptance of everything Greek and Roman as *ipso facto* classical, felt at liberty to choose according to its own unquiet taste, and thus established and for centuries maintained among the canons of classicism the late works of Alexandria and of the Hellenized and Romanized Orient—works which today are perceived not to be classical at all.'

When he turns to the English writers to see in what proportions they have drawn on the Greek romances, Dr Wolff shows an admirable caution. In the case of Lyly for instance, though he brings him in contact with the Greek romance-writers through Boccaccio's 'Tito and Gisippo,' he will not commit himself to the position that Lyly's style is indebted to them directly. A less careful man might perhaps have made that position appear very plausible. This caution lends weight to the author's positive conclusions in regard to the *Arcadia*. 'Its material in plot and character, however diffuse and various, is held firmly within the Heliodorean frame; its descriptive matter is strongly flavoured with the Greek Romance ἔκφρασις; its structure has been deliberately recast' (i.e. as seen by comparing the *Arcadia* of 1590 with the 'Old Arcadia' of which three manuscripts were found by Mr Dobell) 'in the mould of Heliodorus; its style speaks with the voice of the Greek Romancers. Sidney has domesticated the *genre*.' Greene, as Dr Wolff holds, began by transcribing unessential details from Achilles Tatius, but in *Pandosto*, in which story the influence of Greek romances upon him is strongest, while he takes a little from Achilles Tatius, he 'gets structure as well as matter from the solid Heliodorus, together with incident and ornament from the decorative Longus.' Nashe appears to make no use whatever of the Greek romances and Lodge to confine himself to two allusions to the *Æthiopica*.

These conclusions are not lightly arrived at, and after one has read the evidence for them one is not disposed to quarrel with the author's judgment. Almost the only sentence in the book which seems to show a tendency to make too much of resemblances between authors, is one, p. 455, relating to the incident of the hunt in *The Winter's Tale*, III, iii, which is not found in *Pandosto*. Dr Wolff argues that Shakespeare found it in Day's version of *Daphnis and Chloe*—'There is no reason to suppose that Shakespeare invented it, when it lay ready to his hand' there. But Dr Wolff shows that the hunt-incident gives just the

causation required. Why should Shakespeare's invention be supposed to stop at this point, when we have no other reason for supposing that he had any other source for *The Winter's Tale* than Greene's story?

Dr Wolff writes in a free style, with an occasional condescension to colloquial turns, but no empty pretentiousness. Valuable and suggestive criticism is often stowed away even in his notes. The book is provided with a bibliography and a full index; but it would have been an assistance to the reader if the running title of the book had been dispensed with, and in place of it every page had been headed by an indication of its main topic. The book would also have been more handy if it had been divided into two volumes.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Rich's 'Apolonius & Silla,' an Original of Shakespeare's 'Twelfth Night.' Edited by Morton Luce. (The Shakespeare Library.) 1912. 8vo. xii + 96 pp.

It will be a satisfaction to all students of English that Mr Morton Luce has so far recovered from illness as to be able to make another contribution to our knowledge of Elizabethan literature. In reprinting Barnabe Rich's *Apolonius & Silla*, he has not only made accessible an Elizabethan story which is interesting in itself, but he has put the general reader in a better position to consider the question of the sources of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*. By way of further assistance Mr Luce has provided an Introduction, in which he sets forth the different versions of the *Gli Ingannati* story, gives extracts from several of them, and indicates points in which Shakespeare may be thought to have owed something to one or another. Mr Luce believes that Shakespeare was acquainted with versions of the story in several languages, and while he took Rich's tale as his chief source, he drew on *Gli Ingannati* for the comedy and on Bandello for the romance of his play. He thinks further that he took the name 'Cesario' from Gonzaga's *Gli Inganni*, and a suggestion or two from the French of Belleforest, and possibly also from the Cambridge Latin play *Lælia*. Many will prefer to look on some of the resemblances between Shakespeare's comedy and the other works as accidental, and will perhaps doubt the poet's ability or inclination to draw at the same time from Italian, French and Latin sources. But I believe that anyone who carefully considers the evidence of *Twelfth Night* will find it very difficult to account for the facts on the theory that Shakespeare's only source was *Apolonius & Silla*.

It is a pity that Mr Luce's final corrections of his manuscript somehow failed to be printed, and that it has been necessary to insert a list of Errata, which in itself is not quite exhaustive.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

The Poems of John Cleveland. Edited by JOHN M. BERDAN. New Haven: Yale University Press. (London: Henry Frowde. 1911.) 8vo. 270 pp.

This, so far as we know, is the first modern edition of Cleveland's poetical work, and we owe thanks to Mr Berdan for giving it to us, because though Cleveland was undoubtedly a bad writer, he was bad in an interesting manner, and some knowledge of him is necessary to the student of English literature. He represented the faults of the 'metaphysical' poets in an extreme form, and at the same time he is the first English political satirist of any note. The extent to which he appealed to the taste of his age on one or other of these grounds is indicated by the very numerous editions of his poems from 1647 to 1689. Everyone knows Dryden's references to him in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, and the word 'Clevelandism,' which Dryden coins to express the peculiar abuse of language which was characteristic of him; and we are familiar with the quotations from him in Johnson's 'Life of Cowley,' where he is cited in company with Donne and Cowley as a shocking example: but few have gone much further, and 'The Rebel Scot,' once so famous, is left unread.

Mr Berdan adopts the edition of 1677 as the basis of his text, and is duly cautious of admitting poems not accepted as Cleveland's by the editors of that edition, which was undertaken with the avowed purpose of separating the genuine works from those which had been foisted upon him. He publishes nevertheless a section of poems which, not being in the edition of 1677, have been 'attributed to Cleveland by modern scholars,' only one of which, the lines on Ben Jonson printed in *Jonsonus Virbius*, seems to be certainly his, though the *News from Newcastle* is very much in his manner. Mr Berdan gives a very useful tabular statement of the poems included in the various editions, and he also supplies collations of the text of a good many, though without any sufficiently clear statement of the principles on which he has worked. But the most difficult portion of the editor's task in this case is the annotation. Cleveland was difficult even to readers of his own day: 'we cannot read a verse of Cleveland's,' says Eugenius in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, 'without making a face at it, as if every word were a pill to swallow: he gives us many times a hard nut to break our teeth, without a kernel for our pains.' And the difficulty has been much increased for us moderns by the personal and political references, which to readers of his day were easily intelligible. The editor has given us some assistance, but we need a good deal more: many difficulties are left unexplained in his notes, some are explained wrongly, and in some cases the notes are superfluous or irrelevant. It is superfluous, for example, to annotate 'Stagirite,' 'Pelops,' 'Cacus,' &c.; and it is beside the mark to illustrate the lines,

> Like Royston crows, who are (as I may say)
> Friars of both the Orders, Black and Gray,

by an anecdote intended to suggest the superior cunning of the Royston crow, when all that Cleveland refers to is its combination of black and grey plumage. With regard to omissions we may note that in the lines 'On the Memory of Mr Edward King' there is no note on ll. 31 f.,

> An ominous legacy, that did portend
> Thy fate and predecessor's second end,

nor on the succeeding passage about the parallel kinds produced on earth and in the sea. (We may note also that the couplet,

> Books, arts and tongues were wanting, but in thee
> Neptune hath got an university,

is unfortunately misprinted.) In 'Rupertismus' there is no note on ll. 59 f.,

> He who the old philosophy controls
> That voted down plurality of souls!

though the sentence construction and the reference are both obscure. Again, such a phrase as 'Enjoy a copyhold of victory' (l. 156) ought surely to have been dealt with, and the curse 'Now Rupert take thee, rogue,' (which moreover is punctuated wrongly), might well have had some illustration.

There are some positive errors; e.g. in the poem 'To the State of Love' the author says,

> It was a she so glittering bright,
> You'd think her soul an Adamite;
> A person of so rare a frame,
> Her body might be lined with the same.

That is, probably, her soul was so bright that it seemed to dispense with its clothing of body, and yet her outward frame was so beautiful that it might have served instead of a soul, her body might have been sufficiently 'lined' with its mere physical beauty. The editor's note could hardly be worse: 'There is no noun for *with the same* except Adamite; here [the author] seems to confuse that word with *adamant*, which in its double meaning of attraction and diamond, exactly gives the sense.' Again just below we read,

> Not the fair Abbess of the skies
> With all her nunnery of eyes
> Can shew me such a glorious prize!

where the editor says, 'Juno is the *Abbess of the Skies*, and her bird is the peacock.' But surely the 'Abbess of the Skies' is the Moon, and 'her nunnery of eyes' the stars, over which she seems coldly and purely to preside. On p. 107 'inceptor' means one who is about to take his (M.A.) degree, not a freshman, as suggested doubtfully in the note: on p. 147 'collegiates' does not mean 'collections,' but simply members of an assembly or collection, and offers no difficulty. On the other hand Mr Berdan is undoubtedly right, as against the Oxford Dictionary and other authorities, in his explanation of 'he's a galliard by himself'

as applied to Selden in 'The Mixed Assembly,' l. 88. The talk is of dancing, and to each lay member an ecclesiastical partner is assigned, except to Selden, who has to dance by himself because none can match him,

> there's more divines in him
> Than in all this, their Jewish Sanhedrin.

This mention of a galliard as a 'pas de seul' may be illustrated from the poem 'Upon an Hermaphrodite,' l. 57 f.,

> Nor is't a galliard danced by one,
> But a mixed dance, though alone.

On the whole we may say that, in spite of faults and omissions, this is a helpful book to the student of English Literature.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Traherne's Poems of Felicity. Edited from the MS. by H. I. Bell. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. xli + 150 pp.

It is now some nine years since Mr Bertram Dobell startled the literary world by the discovery and the publication of the poems of Thomas Traherne. Traherne, known to a few curious students as a divine, may be said to have come to his own as a poet by accident, for it was by the merest chance that a manuscript once in the possession of Dr Grosart came into Mr Dobell's hands. Mr Dobell's identification of the authorship of the poems was, in its way, quite a triumphant piece of work, and a note of triumph ran through the entire preface in which he introduced the long-forgotten poet to the world. It is strange to think that, while the appearance of Mr Dobell's edition was due to a lucky find on a second-hand bookstall, there lay all the time in the British Museum another, and a fuller, manuscript of Traherne's poems. It is this manuscript which Mr Bell has edited and published in this little volume under the title which it actually bears, 'Poems of Felicity'—'felicity' being, by the way, one of Traherne's pet words in both his prose and his poetry. The text of Mr Bell's manuscript is not always satisfactory, and differs in many places, and often for the worse, from that published by Mr Dobell. This appears to be due to the fact that the manuscript is written by the hand of the poet's brother, Philip, and that the poems were 'prepared' by him for the press. The main value of Mr Bell's volume, however, lies in the new poems which it contains. Not indeed that they will add anything to Traherne's reputation as established by Mr Dobell's edition. There is nothing here surpassing the best of what we already knew of Traherne's poems, but there is much, as Mr Bell holds, that is equal to that best. Mr Dobell, pardonably enough in the first flush of discovery, claimed that 'neither Herbert, Crashaw nor Vaughan can

compare with Traherne in the most essential qualities of poetry.' Mr Bell's estimate of Traherne's poetical qualities is much nearer the mark when he says that 'it is probably true that Traherne is not primarily a poet at all. His verse is full of the material of poetry; it is continually preparing (so to say) to pass into poetry, and here and there for a few lines, sometimes for longer, it does so; but for the most part it remains imperfectly fused; the lyrical impulse is insufficient to convert the thought into the fine gold of poetry, and we get the impression rather of imaginative thought turned into verse than of a naturally poetic inspiration finding its inevitable expression.'

Traherne has a closer kinship, perhaps, with Henry Vaughan than with any other of his contemporaries; but it is easy to exaggerate the resemblances between them. Indeed, the manuscript afterwards secured by Mr Dobell narrowly escaped publication as an undiscovered collection of Vaughan's poems. Long before it came into Mr Dobell's hands, the manuscript was actually shewn to me by the late Dr Grosart, who had just got hold of it—and that was at a bookstall, too,—and talked with enthusiasm about a new edition of Vaughan's poems which he was then projecting, and which was to include his newly-acquired treasures! Traherne has had long to wait for his due recognition as a poet; and, by a strange irony, the discovery of his poems led almost immediately to the discovery that his prose-writings were better than his poetry. For there is nothing in these 'Poems of Felicity' equal as poetry to the beautiful prose of *Centuries of Meditations*.

W. Lewis Jones.

Bangor.

Les Sœurs Brontë. By E. Dimnet. Paris: Bloud. 1911. 8vo. xii + 272 pp.

There is always a special interest in the literary criticism of one nation by another. We stand in too close a relationship to those of our own race for us to be certain of seeing them in proper perspective, and the difference in point of view which a difference of nationality inevitably implies is of the greatest possible value in estimating a writer. The series of *Grands écrivains étrangers*, to which M. Dimnet's study of the Brontë family belongs, is intended primarily for French readers, and therefore lays stress upon the French point of view, and for this very reason it has a peculiar interest and value for English students of literature. *Les Sœurs Brontë* has little to add to the known facts of the lives of the Brontës, and its actual criticism of their works is somewhat superficial. The rugged, passionate verse of Currer, Ellis, and Acton Bell is ill-suited for translation into French—though M. Dimnet's renderings show wonderful sympathy with the spirit of the originals—and a synopsis of *Jane Eyre* or *Wuthering Heights* gives but a slight idea of their extraordinary vitality. But when M. Dimnet compares the works of Charlotte Brontë with those of George Sand, or passes from a discussion

of the melodramatic elements in *Jane Eyre* to a criticism of modern French realism, he has much to say that is stimulating and suggestive. 'Vous vous accommodez parfaitement de livres sans caractères, ni vérité profonde et ramassée, ni intérêt d'aucune sorte, pourvu qu'ils ressemblent exactement à la vie de Pierre ou de Jacques,' might as aptly refer to many of our own would-be realistic studies as to those of our neighbours, and in a sentence M. Dimnet reveals one of the most striking qualities of genius as opposed to talent, that of expressing the individuality of what it depicts. Lowood is a charity school, a type, and yet it is Lowood and no other place.

The influence of Haworth itself, and of the strange, lonely life led by the three girls, is well brought out. In a few points the author differs from Mrs Gaskell, and his insistence on the gentle and softening character of the south-west of England is evidently the result of hearsay rather than of knowledge. The book, however, forms a useful and interesting introduction to the work of the Brontës, and will be read with pleasure by those whose need for an introduction of any sort is long passed.

GRACE E. HADOW.

CIRENCESTER.

Der Cambridger Psalter. Herausgegeben von KARL WILDHAGEN. I. Text mit Erklärungen. (*Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa*, VII Band.) Hamburg: Henri Grand. 1910. 8vo. xxiii + 416 pp.

The chief feature of this edition is the great attention paid to the Latin portions of the Psalter. Here Dr Wildhagen's object is twofold; first to give a restored text; and secondly to indicate the places where the present Psalter varies not only from the Psalterium Romanum, or the Psalterium Gallicum, but from the other Latin Psalters discussed by Rahlfs[1]. The Old English glosses are treated on similar lines. Having sought to restore the text, the editor gives variants, first from the Vespasian Glosses, and then from all other extant Psalter glosses with which a relationship can be claimed, including even those yet unpublished. For the execution of this design, Dr Wildhagen has found an invaluable ally in his printer, who has devised the means of distinguishing two parallel texts of Latin and English, each with its set of footnotes, and each bristling with an array of variants, omissions, and additions. The triumph is due to the use of an extraordinary variety of type, brackets, underlines, and so on; and since the editor does not conceal his own feelings on the outward appearance of the book, we venture to add that its pages often recall to us vividly those of a *Kursbuch*.

This is, then, the most elaborate edition of an Old English Psalter yet published; and herein lies its cardinal fault. In a word, too much is attempted. The value of a careful study of the Latin text on the

[1] A. Rahlfs, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, Göttingen, 1907.

part of an editor, whose chief concern may be the English glosses, is obvious; but after all, this is primarily an edition of certain Old English glosses, and when Dr Wildhagen crowds his footnotes with variants from other Latin Psalters, the connexion of which with ours is often extremely remote, or when he gives the Hebrew original of a Latin reading, we feel that he is endeavouring to do too much. We feel also that he is getting out of his depth. He admits that his knowledge of the Latin Psalters is obtained second-hand, and it is no less clear (cf. pp. 48, 79) that he 'has not the Hebrew.' In dealing with the Old English portions of the text, Dr Wildhagen is on safer ground, but he again fails to escape the charge of excessive elaboration. It was obviously right to devote all attention to the Vespasian Glosses, but the time was hardly ripe for attempting an elaborate comparison with other Psalters, particularly with those extant only in manuscript. Each fresh edition of an Old English Psalter shows the peculiar difficulty attached to this kind of work, and it is idle to pretend that the hasty collation which we have here of the Psalters still unprinted, can have a permanent value. The footnotes are more explanatory than those belonging to the Latin text; and together with much that is sound, they show signs of haste and fancifulness. Dr Wildhagen seems to have a mania for discovering new words. Thus (Ps. lxii, 8) a note on *ic gystige*, written over *exultabo*, runs: "...Ich stelle das Verbum zu ae. *giest* 'Hefe,' 'Schaum' und verstehe: 'ich schäume über (sc. vor Freude)." It is surely more reasonable to suppose that *exulabo* was read. Or again (Ps. xxxv, 4), when confronted with *word mine his* over *Uerba oris eius*, the editor rightly suggests that the second word is due to an unconscious repetition of the familiar combination *word mine*, but cannot help adding "Immerhin möchte ich nicht unterlassen, auf das Kelt. *min* 'Mund,' 'Lippe' (Breton, Welsch, *min*, etc.) hinzuweisen."

In his general attitude to the text, Dr Wildhagen is conservative to a fault. Even mis-spellings, though corrected by the same hand, are restored. In the Latin much trouble is spent over the variations between *-ti-* and *-ci-*, and our editor is ready with his asterisk to mark such innocent forms as *set, quot, temtauerunt.* On the other hand, Old English spellings are left in all their lawlessness. Where, however, a form appears rare or hitherto unrecorded, it is enshrined in an appendix. Here the list, imposing at first sight, requires curtailment, or the asterisk (now a danger-signal) might have been much more freely used. Many words in this list reappear in the corresponding places in other Psalters. Too much importance is attached to variations between the prefixes *of-*, *on-*, *a-*, which were confused together in the language of this period; and a distinction between the uses of *up-* and *ut-* as separable or inseparable prefixes, can hardly be maintained. Lastly, forms like *forcuman* (praeuenire), *gelæcun* (to have in common!), *neftcyrrend* (non rediens), are set forth without any warning. In short Dr Wildhagen is clearly apt to place too much trust in his scribe.

In frankly anticipating some of the criticisms here offered, Dr Wildhagen submits that allowance should be made him for having

done his work on a peculiarly elaborate scale. His claim is just, and his diligence has been most praiseworthy, but the execution of the work makes it questionable whether some of the results will have the value he expects.

It must be added that to the volume is prefixed a portrait and memoir of the late Professor Wülker.

A. O. Belfour.

Belfast.

A Shakespeare Glossary. By C. T. Onions. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1911. 8vo. xii + 259 pp.

This must be regarded as one of the by-products of the *New English Dictionary*, and it is a very valuable one. Mr Onions has been for many years one of the staff employed upon that great undertaking, and now that it is approaching its completion, the Delegates of the Clarendon Press have authorized the issue of this volume, which is mainly based upon it. It is not a complete Shakespeare Dictionary, but it aims at recording and explaining all uses of words which offer any difficulty, or are in any way different from modern practice, and Mr Onions has interpreted this limitation in such a manner that very few words escape him altogether. The greatest danger of misunderstanding for the inexperienced reader of the text of Shakespeare lies in the words which are current in modern use, but in a somewhat different sense; and as a means of setting him on his guard against this, the student will do well to read a few pages here and there of Mr Onions' Glossary. His eyes will almost certainly be opened to many things which he would not otherwise have noticed. The word 'conclusion' for example, as it occurs in the phrase 'to try conclusions' (*Hamlet*, III, iv, 195) or even in *Cymb.* I, v, 18,

> is't not meet
> That I did amplify my judgement in
> Other conclusions?

might well pass unobserved, with a vague application of one or other of the modern meanings. But when our attention is called to other passages in which it occurs, as *Ant. and Cleop.* V, ii, 356,

> She hath pursued conclusions infinite
> Of easy ways to die,

we see at once that the Elizabethan meaning 'experiment' is that which best suits all these passages, and probably also *Othello*, I, iii, 334,

> the blood and baseness of our natures would conduct us to most preposterous conclusions.

So also 'a foregone conclusion' in *Othello*, III, iii, 429, meaning 'a previous experiment,' but this last passage is rather strangely omitted by Mr Onions under 'conclusion,' though given under 'foregone.' Again, the

words of *Hamlet*, III, iv, 52, 'what act that roars so loud and thunders in the index?' may easily have a wrong meaning attached to them by the modern reader, unless he is reminded that an 'index' for the Elizabethans was a table of contents prefixed to a book, hence a 'prologue,' 'preface,' as in *Troilus*, I, iii, 343, *Othello*, II, i, 265. When Romeo says of philosophy, 'It helps not, it prevails not,' it is not superfluous that we should be told that 'prevails' here is equivalent to 'avails' (cp. 'this unprevailing woe' in *Hamlet*). Mr Onions has done his work very well, both in such cases as we have referred to, and in the explanation of more obvious difficulties, and he warns his reader by appropriate signs where there is doubt or dispute about an interpretation, or where the reading of the text is questionable. Some various readings which are certainly erroneous are nevertheless allowed a place in the text, because they have been adopted in many editions, as Pope's conjecture 'marish' in 1 *Henry VI*, I, i, 50, where the original 'nourish,' in the sense of 'nurse,' is now admitted to be correct. Mr Onions claims to have been able, either with the help of the *New English Dictionary* or from other resources, to explain many things more correctly or more fully than previous glossarists have done: e.g. 'I love a ballad in print alife,' i.e. 'dearly' (from 'lief') where most editors read 'o' life'; 'to relish a love-song like a robin-redbreast,' where 'relish,' which is ignored in most of the glossaries, has been shewn to be a musical term meaning 'warble,' or 'sing with variations.' He has also paid special attention to the relation of Shakespeare's vocabulary to that of the dialect of the Midlands, and especially of his own county, Warwickshire, as illustrated by not a few words, as 'ballow,' 'batlet,' 'chop' (in the sense of 'thrust'), 'geck,' 'grow to,' 'mobled,' 'muss,' 'sight' (for the pupil of the eye), 'tarre,' etc.

Naturally there are some cases in which we disagree with Mr Onions. We will take a few examples from *Hamlet*. The interpretation of 'flushing' as 'redness,' in I, ii, 155, is probably wrong: the expression 'Had left the flushing' means apparently 'had ceased to flow.' In I, iv, 9 Mr Onions (with the *N. E. D.*) takes 'reels' as a noun: but it is much more probably a verb, either transitive or intransitive. In III, i, 83 Mr Onions understands 'conscience' in the ordinary modern meaning, 'sense of right and wrong,' whereas it must surely mean here 'thought,' 'reflection,' as the context shews[1]. It is well that Mr Onions should explain 'sables,' in III, ii, 139, as the (brown) fur of the sable, worn on rich garments, and opposed to mourning, 'Nay then, let the devil wear black, for I'll have a suit of sables,' but there is surely no reason to suspect quibbling, which is quite out of place here. (The *N. E. D.* deals with it under the head of 'sable' = 'black,' but the later instances of 'sables' in the sense of mourning garments are probably influenced by a misunderstanding of this passage.) There are not many omissions in this book, but a reference should have been given to *Lear*, IV, vi, 227 for 'pregnant to,' in the sense of 'disposed to,' and notice might have

[1] In these cases Mr Onions should at least use the asterisk which indicates a doubtful solution.

been taken of 'your,' as used in the phrase 'your worm is your only emperor for diet,' 'your water is a sore decayer of your whoreson dead body,' and perhaps also in

> There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
> Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

On the whole we can commend this Shakespeare glossary as the best thing of the kind that has appeared, and as very well fitted to take the place of explanatory notes for those whose object is simply to understand the text. In most cases the conspectus of Shakespearean usage which is afforded by such a glossary as this, is far more valuable than the information which is given by a note, and the convenient size of the book and its cheapness ought to make it suitable for general use.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

The Works of Thomas Deloney. Edited with an introduction and notes by Francis Oscar Mann. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 8vo. xliii + 600 pp.

Mr Mann has rendered a service to Thomas Deloney and to all who can read Elizabethan literature with pleasure. While others have raised the old writer from the ranks of the ballad-mongers to the dignity and estate of an Elizabethan novelist, Mr Mann has established this position in the only final and effective way, by gathering together his author's fugitive efforts into a well printed volume with scholarly notes and an appreciative introduction. At the same time, Mr Mann has put a collection of lively and amusing tales within the reach of this studious generation. For it is something, after studying Nashe's overwrought and erudite tirades or the introspective melancholy of Lyly and Greene, to turn to these stories still fresh with the simplicity of an earlier age, picturing the cheerful aspects of middle class life, telling us of the amusements of 'prentices, their sports, quarrels, love affairs, the *camaraderie* of the guilds, the tricks they played on one another, and the pride they took in their work. Deloney, in spite of what Mr Mann says, was not a realist. The picture is idealised, for we know well from contemporary pamphleteers that the age of Elizabeth was even further from the millennium than our own times. And yet, though Deloney throws over his narratives a zest and an optimism, which was the very soul of the medieval *raconteurs*, his view of life is not confined to the bright side of things. If he tells of penniless 'prentices who married their mistresses or even rose to be Lord Mayor, he also tells of princes and princesses who stooped to be cobblers and serving-maids, of lads who had not the wherewithal to buy a meal, of noblemen who were imprisoned and tortured, and of one ghastly murder which even now makes the reader's flesh creep (*Thomas of Reading,*

chap. xi). There is little or none of the continuity of episodes and development of characters which we expect in a modern novel. *Jacke of Newberie, The Gentle Craft* and *Thomas of Reading* are hardly more than pegs on which a number of independent and traditional stories are hung. The charm of the work consists in its directness and vivacity of narration, or again in the skill with which, in *The Gentle Craft, Part I* (his most ambitious attempt at a fashionable book, enriched with the learning of Pliny and the new ideas of the time) he alternates chapters of euphuistic romance with popular drolleries. Sometimes we meet with touches of character which would not be out of place in the best nineteenth century novels, as for instance in the picture of the old friar who could not say mass without his book and spectacles, though he was blind, and in the description of the disreputable, bedraggled host of Bosome's Inn. Above all, Deloney excels in reproducing chance bits of conversation which give glimpses into the speaker's whole manner of life and habit of thought. It would be hard to beat the passage in which Simon Eyer's wife rates her 'prentice Crispine for marrying at his age, or where she describes her consciousness of social advancement when invited to the Lord Mayor's supper, or urges her husband to accept the office of sheriff; or again, the passages where Meg and Gillian exchange amenities, and where the two gallants, with a *ὕβρις* soon to be followed by *νέμεσις*, boast to each other of the things that they will do to 'lusty Peachey' the master shoemaker; or yet again, the gossip of the housewives (*Thomas of Reading*, chap. xii), varying between the vulgarity of ignorance and the ignorance of superstition; or lastly the fragment of dialogue in which the erratic Tom Drum, 'sitting on a time sadly at work in his masters shop,' is seized with the *Wanderlust* and 'suddenly shrowded up St Hughes bones (i.e. his cobbler's implements) and taking downe his pike-staffe, clapt his pack at his back' informing his employer that he could not stay indoors while the spring sun was shining and the trees were 'deckt with green leaves.'

Thus there are qualities in Deloney's work which should appeal to the most general reader, who cannot enjoy the rather artificial pleasure of recognising familiar allusions in a new author. At the same time Mr Mann's edition is destined primarily for scholars and his first duty is to enable the serious student to see Deloney in his true relation to the literature of the time. With this end in view, he begins with a life of Deloney, about whom, as he shows, very little is known, although he adds a large number of allusions to his author from contemporary writers. Then follows a rather intricate account of the sources and development of Elizabethan prose fiction. Mr Mann shows well how the sixteenth century did not improve on the narrative art of earlier centuries, except in abandoning verse for prose, and why the atmosphere of Elizabethan times hardly favoured the development of the novel in its highest forms. He then traces the two main streams of medieval literature—the romances and epics which appealed to the aristocracy, and the *exempla* and *fabliaux* which the middle classes loved

—and he explains how they reappeared on the one hand in euphuism and prose pastorals, and on the other hand in jest books, 'coney-catching' pamphlets and the first attempts at the picaresque novel. Deloney, he concludes, differed from, or surpassed, Greene, Nashe and others because he 'attains a clearness of construction and homogeneity of atmosphere which is missing in most contemporary fiction; for he writes straightforwardly, from a simple point of view, fitting his stories into an appropriate framework, and informing them with the same vivid life, so that the whole novel is one in atmosphere, if not in connected incident.' In the same way he concludes his introduction by an appreciation of Deloney's poetry, saying something about the character and origin of ballad-sellers and the quality of their work.

Such a sketch of an important field of literature—though, in this case, the sketch is rather diffused and complex—is especially useful when followed by an annotated text of an author who illustrates the principles laid down. Mr Mann explains adequately the allusions and obsolete expressions which confront the reader, and it is a perfect scandal that a commentary which provides so many illustrations to the chroniclers and to Shakespeare, should have no index. But his notes are most instructive where he shows the sources on which Deloney drew for his novels and ballads.

And yet, in spite of the useful information which Mr Mann, with scholarly diligence, has gathered together, we doubt whether he is really familiar with the popular thought and sentiment of the period. Every now and then we meet with gaps which a fuller knowledge would surely have supplied. He might have noticed the similarity between the episode in chap. IV of *Jacke of Newberie* 'How the maidens serued Will Sommers for his sawcinesse' and several escapades in the Jest-books and *Fabliaux*. He might have shown how 'the pictures which Jacke of Newbery had in his house' in chap. V are introduced to gratify the popular taste for *encomia*, of which the most conspicuous example is *Lenten Stuffe*. He should have given a fuller note on Brainford (*The Gentle Craft, The Second Part*, chap. XI) which figured so largely in the people's sentiment. In *Thomas of Reading* he twice misses an obvious occasion (i.e. chaps. II and VI) to draw the reader's attention to the popularity of satires on women such as we find in *The Schole-howse of Women, The Proude Wyves Paternoster* and S. Rowland's *Tis Merrie when Gossips meete*. A similar omission is to be found with reference to the song 'In praise of a single life' in *The Garland of good Will*. Crab's prophecy (*Thomas of Reading*, p. 236) should have been compared with broadside prophecies which at that time were sold in the streets and the prognostications which prominent literary men like Nashe, Breton, Waldegrave and Wither produced. The device by which Sir William Ferris was cured of his obsession (*Thomas of Reading*, p. 253) is far older than the *Decameron* (p. 549). It was known to the physicians of classical times and is described in Reginald Scot's *Discouerie of Witchcraft*.

Mr Mann's introduction has several flashes of wit and insight above

the level of the average commentator, but, like the notes, it is not free from lapses. While it is certainly true that prose is the more suitable medium for the novel, the reader would hardly have been convinced of this truth by Mr Mann's unaided arguments. To imply that the Elizabethan novel 'embraces aspects of human life hostile to poetic treatment,' will hardly convince the reader who recalls how great poets have treated such episodes and characters as Thersites, Gorgo, Corydon, and Sir Kay, not to mention obvious instances drawn from *The Romance of the Rose*, *The Canterbury Tales*, *Hermann und Dorothea*, or *Don Juan*. To say that 'Greene, like Deloney, while using the plainer English for ordinary occasions, *relapses* (the italics are ours) into the euphuistic method immediately he takes in hand a romantic subject,' rather reminds one of the familiar proceeding known as putting the cart before the horse. When suggesting the sources of *Merry Tales*, Mr Mann might have mentioned that the compiler almost certainly drew on Erasmus's *Convivium Fabulosum* and *Apophthegmata* and on Poggio's *Facetiae*, and in showing how the jest books foreshadowed the picaresque novel, we cannot imagine why he omitted so important a link as the *Jestes of George Peele*. With regard to Elizabethan vagabond literature, it is by no means certain that 'Dekker added little to his stolen material but the ornamentation of exuberant fancy,' while 'Greene worked into his 'coney-catching' pamphlets much of his own seamy experience.' Some of Dekker's material is as untraceable as Greene's, and though the life history of both bohemians is lamentably scanty, we know that the author of *The Bellman* did not lack opportunities of studying roguery at first hand.

Some readers may regard it as an even more serious defect that this essay goes over the ground covered by other scholars, without referring to their work. When saying that Deloney's novels 'deserved a recognition less belated' (p. xxxi), Mr Mann might have admitted that they were fully recognised three years ago in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (Vol. III, chap. XVI). If he goes out of his way to state that 'with Petty, and not with Lyly, as M. Jusserand would persuade us, we enter upon the prose literature of the drawing-room' (p. xx) he should have added that Professors Atkins and Feuillerat had already revealed that origin of euphuism. When describing the character of the Elizabethan ballad (p. xxxvii) he should not have omitted mention of the essay prefacing the *Shirburn Ballads*, especially as his own estimate is similar to that of Mr Clark. When he says that 'the continuity of the medieval and Tudor ages has been strangely overlooked' (p. xviii), he himself even more strangely overlooks the research of the last few years. In spite of such blemishes, Mr Mann's edition is meritorious, and the present writer emphasises these details only because the book must soon be in the hands of every serious student of the novel and, it is hoped, of many less specialised readers as well.

H. V. Routh.

Cambridge.

MINOR NOTICES.

The Divine Poet is beloved of the great ones of the earth, and the *Divine Comedy* has been the delight, and the literary hobby of many of the most eminent men of the last few generations. In *The Divina Commedia of Dante Alighieri, literally translated into English Verse in the hendecasyllabic measure of the orginal Italian* by the Rt Hon. Sir Samuel Walker Griffith, we have the Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia turning his hand to that very difficult, but fascinating task—an attempt to supersede, or to supplement, the standard English translations of the *Divina Commedia.*

He starts with a high ideal of what translation means, in loyalty, and in self-effacement; and he realises that if identity of measure is to be attempted, rhyme must be abandoned. So instead of the more usual decasyllable with *terza rima* or less complicated rhyme, we have here a faithful reproduction—as faithful as circumstances will permit—of the rhythm of Dante's verse. It has come to be taken for granted that a sustained series of hendecasyllables would prove banal or ridiculous, though a page or so might be tolerable, as a *tour de force.* A perusal of this volume challenges one to consider whether such a judgement is not too hasty and too sweeping. The more one reads, the less one is inclined to criticize; and though the first impression is that of loss of dignity and solemnity, the feeling grows that, after all, the majesty of Dante's verse is built up of that common speech and phraseology of everyday persons, which was one of the reasons for the title 'Commedia.'

It may interest the reader to see how a favourite passage looks in this home-spun garb. We take the beginning of *Purg.* VIII.

> Now was the hour that fond desire awakens
> In those at sea, and fills the heart with yearning
> The day they bid Good-bye to friends belovèd,
> And pricks with love the new-departed pilgrim,
> If the church-bell he heareth in the distance
> That seems to mourn the day as it is dying....

L. R.

In his monograph, *Mathew Carey, Editor, Author and Publisher* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1912), Mr Earle Bradsher gives us an interesting review of the state of the book trade in America between 1784 and 1839. Carey was a man of exceptional intelligence and public spirit, and a publisher whose fair dealing was acknowledged even by authors; and he unquestionably rendered great services to the literature of his adopted country. Perhaps the most interesting portions of this essay are those which deal with the competition of American publishers for advance copies of books published in England, the *Waverley Novels,* for example. With fifteen or twenty days' start, Carey's

firm could undertake to obtain the absolute command of the American market, and as much as £75 was sometimes paid to Messrs Constable for such an advance copy. The following extract from a letter to the agents in London, dated June, 1823, illustrates the state of things fairly well:

> We have received 'Quentin Durward' most handsomely and have the Game completely in our own hands this time....In two days we shall publish it here [Philadelphia] and in New York, and the Pirates may print it as soon as they please. The opposition Edition will be out in about 48 hours after they have one of our Copies, but we shall have complete and entire possession of every market in the Country for a short time. Independently of profit, it is in the highest degree gratifying to be able to manage the matter in our own way without fear of interference....It frequently happens that we are 70 or 80 days without intelligence from England. One day will bring a vessel in 60 days, next day in 50 and the following day one in 40 or 35, so that our 15 or 20 days are completely lost to us. We are very desirous of taking every precaution against losing the advantage for which we pay so heavily, and which is lost unless we have a few days' start, as we cannot bring the book into the Market so soon as the opposition. They publish as soon as they can have ten Copies from the press, while we cannot until we have at least 2000 or 2500. They print for their own stores. We do it for the supply of a whole country, and we must send off to our correspondents as soon as we publish here. You will please to take all these matters into consideration, and make the best arrangements in your power for us.

The essay, which is largely based on unpublished documents, seems to be carefully put together, and is certainly 'a contribution to knowledge worthy of publication.'

Professor R. P. Cowl edits *An Anthology of Imaginative Prose* (London, Herbert and Daniel) which is certainly a most attractive little volume. It is designed to exemplify the power of English prose as a medium of imaginative or poetic expression, and to illustrate the wealth of our literature in those varieties of prose commonly described as ornate, impassioned, cadenced or rhythmical. The range of selection, from 'Sir John Mandeville' to 'Fiona Macleod,' is sufficiently wide. The largest shares of space are given to Milton, the Authorised Version of the Bible, Ruskin, and Jeremy Taylor (in the order named), and then come Sir Thomas Browne, Burton (who is surely overrated), Donne, and Carlyle. The selections made are almost invariably good, but there are omissions. In the Preface reference is made to 'the inspired prose of a Plato or a Bacon,' yet Bacon is represented only by two extracts from the essay *Of Gardens*, which moreover mostly consist of catalogues of flowers and fruits. The other essays are completely passed over, and yet such passages as the following surely deserve the name of imaginative prose: 'The first creature of God in the works of the days was the light of the sense; the last was the light of reason; and his Sabbath work ever since is the illumination of his Spirit....Certainly it is heaven upon earth to have a man's mind move in Charity, rest in Providence, and turn upon the poles of Truth.' 'Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament; Adversity is the blessing of

the New; which carrieth the greater benediction and the clearer revelation of God's favour. Yet even in the Old Testament, if you listen to David's harp, you shall hear as many hearselike airs as carols; and the pencil of the Holy Ghost hath laboured more in describing the afflictions of Job than the felicities of Salomon.' 'But little do men perceive what solitude is and how far it extendeth. For a crowd is not company, and faces are but a gallery of pictures, and talk but a tinkling cymbal, where there is no love.' Again, it seems to us that Burke is but scantily honoured in the two short passages which are taken from him, and Landor is insufficiently represented by a bare four pages.

However, we have certainly no desire to quarrel with the book, which is by far the best thing of the kind that we have seen, and of which the paper and printing are worthy of the contents.

Attention is called by the Cambridge University Press to Mr Charles H. Gray's book entitled *Lodowick Carliell* (Chicago University Press, 1905), in which the life and work of that dramatist is investigated, and his best play, *The Deserving Favourite*, is reprinted. The surname is the same as that of Thomas Carlyle, who recognised his kinship with the Carlyles of Bridekirk (not far from Ecclefechan), of whom the dramatist was one. The name was variously spelt Carlell, Carlisle, Carlile and Carliell, but the last form is that which seems to have been used in the author's signatures. The ascertainable facts of his life have been collected by Mr Gray with praiseworthy diligence, and it furnishes an interesting example of the close connexion in the reign of Charles I between the royal household and the stage. Lodowick Carliell was first a groom of the privy chamber and 'Gentleman of the Bows,' and then one of the two keepers of the royal deer park at Richmond, a post which the sporting traditions of his family must have made congenial to him. He was exceptionally fortunate in the fact that he was adequately provided for by pension after the Restoration. His extant plays, produced, with one exception, from 1629 to 1642, are of a romantic character, and to some extent foreshadow the sentiment of the 'heroic' drama, while exhibiting that helpless breakdown of dramatic blank verse which was characteristic of the period. *The Deserving Favourite* is here reprinted from the quarto of 1629, collated with that of 1659. The plot of the play, as the editor shews, is to a great extent drawn from a contemporary Spanish novel. Originally written for the Court, it speedily found its way to the 'common stage,' where it seems to have had some success, and no doubt the improbable disguises and discoveries with which it abounds were very much in accordance with the taste of the time. The author speaks of his 'known want of learning,' but classical allusions are rather frequent and he certainly had some technical skill as a dramatist.

Mr Gray seems to have done his work conscientiously as editor.

G. C. M.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

June—August, 1912.

GENERAL.

Bergmann, K., Die gegenseitigen Beziehungen der deutschen, englischen und französischen Sprache auf lexikologischem Gebiete. (Neusprachliche Abhandlungen, xviii.) Dresden, C. A. Koch. 4 M. 40.

Festschrift zum 15. Neuphilologentage in Frankfurt am Main, 1912. Frankfort, Gebrüder Knauer.

Lommel, H., Studien über indogermanische Femininbildungen. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 2 M.

Topolovsek, J., Die sprachliche Urverwandtschaft der Indogermanen, Semiten und Indianer. Vienna, H. Kirsch. 5 M.

Zenker, R., Zur Mabinogionfrage. Eine Antikritik. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Bibliotheca romanica. No. 154—156. B. Guarini, Opere. Il pastor fido. No. 159, 160. J. J. Rousseau, Les rêveries du promeneur solitaire. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no. 40 pf.

Feller, J., Notes de philologie wallonne. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Meyer-Lübke, W., Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, iii. Reihe.) 4. Lieferung. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Italian.

Alagna, G., Lo spirito nuovo di Giuseppe Parini. Palermo, A. Trimarchi. 1 L. 50.

Alfieri, V., Le Tragedie, scelte ed illustrate da M. Scherillo. (Biblioteca classica Hoepliana.) Milan, U. Hoepli. 1 L. 50.

Battisti, C., Le dentali esplosive intervocali nei dialetti italiani. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Beihefte, xxviiia.) Halle, Niemeyer. 10 M.

Cappelletti, L., Osservazioni storiche e letterarie e notizie sulle fonti del Decamerone. 2da ediz. Rocca S. Casciano, L. Cappelli. 2 L.

De Sanctis, F., Storia della letteratura italiana a cura di B. Croce. Vol. i, ii. (Scrittori d'Italia, xxxi, xxxii.) Bari, G. Laterza. Each 5 L. 50.

Folengo, T., Opere italiane, a cura di U. Renda. Vol. ii. (Scrittori d'Italia, xxviii.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Hautecœur, L., Rome et la Renaissance de l'antiquité à la fin du xviii^e siècle. (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fasc. cv.) Paris, Fontemoing. 18 fr.

Manzoni, A., Opere. Vol. iv, parte i. Carteggio di A. Manzoni a cura di G. Sforza e G. Gallavresi. Milan, U. Hoepli. 6 L. 50.

Marino, G. B., Epistolario, seguito da lettere di altri scrittori del seicento, a cura di A. Borzelli e F. Nicolini. Vol. ii. (Scrittori d'Italia, xxix.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

McLeod, A., Plays and Players in Modern Italy : being a Study of the Italian Stage as affected by the political and social life, manners and characters of to-day. London, Smith, Elder. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Polo, M., Il Milione secondo il testo della Crusca, reintegrato con gli altri codici italiani a cura di D. Olivieri. (Scrittori d'Italia, xxx.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Settimelli, E., La critica di B. Croce. (Collezione di saggi critici diretta da B. Corradini e E. Settimelli, ii.) Rome, Athenaeum. 2 L. 50.

Spanish.

Cejador y Frauca, J., Tesoro de la lengua castellana. Lo que dicen las palabras. Sibilantes. i. Parte. Madrid, Paes. 12 pes.

Cervantes, M. de, El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha. Edición y notas de F. Rodríguez Marín. (Clasicos Castellanos.) Madrid, Ediciones de 'La Lectura.' Paris, H. Champion.

Curzon, H. de, Un théâtre d'idées en Espagne. Le théâtre de Jose Echegaray. Étude analytique. Paris, Fischbacher. 5 fr.

Menéndez Pidal, R., Edición paleográfica del Cantar de Mio Cid. Madrid, Bailly-Baillière. 4 pes.

Pérez Pastor, C., Noticias y documentos relativos a la Historia y Literatura españolas. Tomo i. Madrid.

Rennert, H. A., The Spanish Pastoral Romances. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures.) Philadelphia, Pa.

French.

(*a*) *General.*

Meunier, J. M., Atlas linguistique et Tableaux des pronoms personnels du Nivernais. Supplément de l'étude morphologique sur les pronoms personnels dans les parlers actuels du Nivernais. Paris, H. Champion. 25 fr.

Meunier, J. M., Étude morphologique sur les pronoms personnels dans les parlers actuels du Nivernais. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

Meunier, J. M., Monographie phonétique du parler de Chaulgnes, Canton de la Charité-sur-Loire. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

Meunier, J. M., Index lexicographique. Supplément de la monographie phonétique du parler le Chaulgnes (Nièvre). Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Schinz, A., Les accents dans l'écriture française, étude critique de leurs diverses fonctions dans le passé et le présent. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr. 50.

Schoch, J., Perfectum historicum und Perfectum praesens im Französischen von seinen Anfängen bis 1700. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, iv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 20.

Tobler, A., Vermischte Beiträge. Der vermischten Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik, 5. Reihe. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 8 M.

Winkler, É., La doctrine grammaticale française d'après Maupas et Oudin. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Beihefte, xxxviii.) Halle, Niemeyer. 12 M.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Benary, W., Die germanische Ermanarichsage und die französische Heldendichtung. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Beihefte, xl.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

Oldest Monuments of the French Language, The, and the Life of Saint Alexis. Translated with Notes. Oxford, J. Thornton. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sondheimer, I., Die Herodes-Partien im lateinischen liturgischen Drama und in den französischen Mysterien. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, iii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 6 M.

Troyes, Chrestien de, Cliges: a Romance. Translated by L. J. Gardiner. (New Mediaeval Library.) London, Chatto and Windus. 5*s.* net.

Vilain Mire, Das altfranzösische Fablel du. Herausgegeben von C. Zipperling. Halle, Niemeyer. 7 M.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Antioche, Comte D', Chateaubriand, ambassadeur à Londres, 1822, d'après ses dépêches inédites. Paris, Perrin. 7 fr. 50.

Baldensperger, F., Beaulavon, G., Benrubi, J., etc., J. J. Rousseau. Conférences faites à l'École des Hautes Études Sociales en 1912. Préface de G. Lanson (Bibl. générale des sciences sociales). Paris, F. Alcan. 6 fr.

Balzac, H. de, La comédie humaine, texte revisé et annoté par M. Bouteron et H. Longnon. Tomes ii, iii. Paris, L. Conard. Each 9 fr.

Berneburg, E., Charakterkomik bei Molière. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, x.) Marburg, A. Ebel. 2 M.

Bersaucourt, A. de, Les pamphlets contre Victor Hugo. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Blay de Gaïx, Baron, Une amie inconnue d'Eugénie de Guérin. Coraly de Gaïx, correspondance et œuvres. Paris, H. Champion. 3 fr. 50.

Bonnefon, P., Correspondance de J. B. Rousseau et de Brossette. Tome ii. 1729–41. (Société des Textes français modernes.) Paris, E. Cornély. 6 fr.

Brangsch, W., Philosophie und Dichtung bei Sully Prudhomme. (Normannia, viii.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M. 50.

Brunetière, F., Histoire de la littérature française classique (1515–1830). Tome ii. Le XVII^e^ siècle. Paris, Ch. Delagrave. 7 fr. 50.

Buffenoir, H., Les portraits de J. J. Rousseau, étude historique et iconographique. 2 vols. Paris, Émile-Paul. 30 fr.

Debré, A., Die Darstellung der Weltgeistlichen bei den französischen Romantikern. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 2 M.

Delafarge, D., La vie et l'œuvre de Palissot (1730–1814). Paris, Hachette. 10 fr.

Doumic, R., Lamartine. (Les grands écrivains français.) Paris, Hachette. 2 fr.

Fabre, J., J. J. Rousseau. Paris, F. Alcan. 2 fr.

Faguet, É., Les amies de Rousseau. Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

Faguet, É., Rousseau artiste. Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

Faguet, É., Rousseau penseur. Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

Fontenelle, Textes choisis et commentés par É. Faguet. (Bibliothèque française.) Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 1 fr. 50.

HAAS, J., Balzacs Scènes de la vie privée von 1830. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, II.) Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 80.

HÖFFDING, H., J. J. Rousseau et sa philosophie, trad. par J. de Coussange. F. Alcan. 2 fr. 50.

HUSZAR, G., L'influence de l'Espagne sur le théâtre français des XVIII^e^ et XIX^e^ siècles. (Études critiques de littérature comparée, III.) Paris, H. Champion. 4 fr.

KLINCKSIECK, F., Der Brief in der französischen Literatur des 19. Jahrh. Eine Auswahl. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M. 50.

LACHÈVRE, F., Le libertinage au XVII^e^ siècle. Une seconde revision des œuvres du poète Th. de Viau, publ. en 1663 par Esprit Aubert. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr. 50.

MARTIN-DECAEN, A., Le dernier ami de J. J. Rousseau. Le marquis de Girardin, 1735–1808. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

MARTINEAU, H., L'itinéraire de Stendhal. (Collection de la Société des Trente.) Paris, A. Messein. 5 fr.

MERLANT, J., Un entretien inconnu de George Sand et de Flaubert sur J. J. Rousseau. Paris, Coulet et fils. 1 fr.

MEYNIER, A., J. J. Rousseau révolutionnaire. Paris, Schleicher frères. 3 fr. 50.

MONTESQUIEU, Textes choisis et commentés par F. Strowski (Bibliothèque française). Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 1 fr. 50.

MORNET, D., Le romantisme en France au XVIII^e^ siècle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

PATERNE BERRICHON, J. A. Rimbaud. Le poète (1854–1873). Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

PATTERSON, J. G., A Zola Dictionary : the Characters of the Rougon-Macquart Novels. London, Routledge. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

PFANDL, L., Abel Hugo und seine französische Übersetzung spanischer Romanzen. Ein Neudruck zur Geschichte der französischen Romantik, mit Einleitung herausgegeben. (Normannia, VI.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M. 50.

PLAN, P. P., J. J. Rousseau et Malesherbes. Un dossier de la Direction de la librairie sous Louis XV. Paris, Fischbacher. 3 fr.

SAILLARD, G., Essai sur la fable en France, au XVIII^e^ siècle. Paris, A. Picard. 5 fr.

SAILLARD, G., Florian, sa vie, son œuvre. Paris, A. Picard. 7 fr. 50.

SCHOMANN, E., Französische Utopisten und ihr Frauenideal. (Normannia, VII.) Berlin, E. Felber. 6 M.

SÉCHÉ, L., Le cénacle de J. Delorme (1827–1830). Tome I. Victor Hugo et les poètes. Tome II. Victor Hugo et les artistes. Paris, Mercure de France. 15 fr.

Sources d'idées, Les, XVI^e^ siècle. Textes choisis et commentés par P. Villey (Bibliothèque française). Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 1 fr. 50.

STENDHAL, Œuvres complètes. Édition définitive publ. par E. Champion. Tome I. Paris, H. Champion. 5 fr.

TIERSOT, J., J. J. Rousseau. (Les maîtres de la musique.) Paris, F. Alcan. 3 fr. 50.

TOUGARD, A., Documents concernant l'histoire littéraire du XVIII^e^ siècle conservés aux archives de l'Académie de Rouen. Tome I. Rouen, A. Lestringant. 12 fr.

Tournoux, G. A., Bibliographie Verlainienne. Contribution critique à l'étude des littératures étrangères et comparées. (Collection bibliographique pour servir à l'histoire du mouvement littéraire contemporain, I.) Leipzig, E. Rowohlt. 7 M. 50.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Panzer, F., Studien zur germanischen Sagengeschichte. II. Sigfrid. Munich, C. H. Beck. 8 M.

Scandinavian.

Ahlström, A., Våra medeltidslagar. Studier i fornsvensk stilistik och prosarytmik. Lund, Gleerupska bokh. 3 Kr. 50.

Cruppi, L., Femmes écrivains d'aujourd'hui. Tome I. Suède. Paris, Fayard. 4 fr.

Edda, Die Lieder der älteren (Sæmundar Edda). Herausgegeben von K. Hildebrand. Völlig umgearbeitet von H. Gering. 3. Auflage. (Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Literatur-Denkmäler, VII.) Paderborn, Schöningh. 8 M.

Edda, Die prosaische, im Auszuge nebst Vǫlsunga-saga und Nornagests-páttr. Mit ausführlichem Glossar herausg. von E. Wilken. 2. Auflage. I. Teil. Text. (Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Literatur-Denkmäler, XI.) Paderborn, Schöningh. 4 M.

Kellgren, J. H., Valda dikter och prosastycken. Utg. af F. Vetterlund. Stockholm, Bonnier. 1 Kr.

Lyth, P. G., Tegnér-studier. Stockholm, Nordiska bokh. 1 Kr. 25.

Naumann, H., Altnordische Namenstudien. (Acta Germanica, Neue Reihe, I.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M.

Palladius, P., Danske Skrifter. Udgivet for Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund af L. Jacobsen. 3.—4. Levering. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 Kr. 90.

Roberts, R. E., Henrik Ibsen : a critical Study. London, M. Secker. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sprogminder, Ældre norske. Udg. af Den norske historiske kildeskrift-kommission. I. Maallære og ordtøke fraa Vest-Agder, fraa fyrste halvti av 1600 talet. (Handsk. No. 464, 8vo i Thottske samling.) Utg. ved T. Hannaas. II. Ordsamling fraa Robyggjelaget fraa slutten av 1600 talet. (Handsk. No. 1506. 4to i Thottske samling.) Utg. ved T. Hannaas. Kristiania, Dybwad. Each 1 Kr. 60.

Þiðriks Saga af Bern. Udgivet for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved H. Bertelsen. 6. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 Kr.

Uddgren, G., A. Strindberg. Början till en biografi. Göteborg, Aahlén och Aakerlund. 1 Kr.

Dutch.

Diederic van Assenede, Floris ende Blancefloer. Uitgeg. door P. Leendertz Jr. (Bibliotheek van middelnederlandsche letterkunde.) 2 vols. Leyden, A. W. Sijthoff. 4 fl. 50.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

Björkman, E., Zur englischen Namenkunde. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, XLVII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

Bladin, V., Studies on Denominative Verbs in English. Dissertation. Upsala.

Koszul, A., Anthologie de la littérature anglaise. Tome I. Des origines au XVIII^e siècle. Paris, Ch. Delagrave. 5 fr.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Boer, R. C., Die altenglische Heldendichtung. I. Béowulf. (Germanistische Handbibliothek, XI.) Halle, Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 5 M.

Grein, C. W. M., Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter. Unter Mitwirkung von F. Holzhausen neu herausgegeben von J. J. Köhler. (Sammlung germanistischen Elementar- und Handbücher, IV. Wörterbücher, IV. Band.) 3. und 4. Lieferung. Heidelberg, C. Winter. Each 1 M. 50.

Pierquin, H., Le poème anglo-saxon de Beowulf. Paris, Picard. 15 fr.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Beaumont, F., and Fletcher, J. Works. Vol. X. (Cambridge English Classics.) Cambridge, University Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Brown, M. J., Historical ballad poetry of Ireland, ed. by. London, Longmans. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Browning, R., Works. Introduction by Sir F. Kenyon. Vol. III. London, Smith, Elder. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Canning, A. S. G., Dickens studied in six Novels. London, Fisher Unwin. 6*s.* net.

Cory, H. E., Spenser, the School of the Fletchers, and Milton. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, II, 5.) Berkeley, Univ. of California Press.

Cowper, W., Letters. Chosen and edited, with a Memoir and a few Notes, by J. G. Frazer. 2 vols. (Eversley Series.) London, Macmillan. 8*s.* net.

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Sidney Lee. Second Supplement. Vol. I. Abbey—Eyre. London, Smith, Elder. 15*s.* net.

Fitzgerald, P., Jane Austen: a Criticism and Appreciation. London, Jarrold. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Kado, M., Swinburne's Verskunst. (Normannia, IX.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M.

Kennedy, J. M., English Literature, 1880–1905. London, S. Swift. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Maistre d'escole Anglois, Le. Von J. B. Gen. Ca. (1580). Herausgegeben von Th. Spira. (Frühneuenglischer Grammatiken, VII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 60.

Malory, Selections from. Chosen and edited by H. Wragg. London, Frowde. 2*s.*

McAfee, C. B., The Greatest English Classic: a Study of the King James Version of the Bible and its Influence on Life and Literature. London, Harper. 5*s.* net.

Meyer-Franck, H., Robert Browning, 'The Ring and the Book.' Eine Interpretation. Göttingen, O. Hapke. 2 M. 80.

Moll, O. E. E., Der Stil von Byron's Childe Harold's Pilgrimage. (Normannia, X.) Berlin, E. Felber. 2 M. 50.

Reuning, K., Das Altertümliche im Wortschatz der Spenser-Nachahmungen des 18. Jahrh. (Quellen und Forschungen, CXVI.) Strassburg, Trübner. 6 M. 25.

Saintsbury, G. A History of English Prose Rhythm. London, Macmillan. 14*s.*

Schulz, E., Die englischen Schwankbücher bis herab zu 'Dobson's drie bobs' (1607). (Palaestra, CXVII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M. 50.

Shakespeare, W., The Life of Henry V. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. (Old-spelling Shakespeare.) London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der deutschen. xlviii. Jahrgang. Berlin-Schöneberg, Langenscheidt. 11 M.

Sinclair, M., The Three Brontës. London, Hutchinson. 6*s.* net.

Sixtus, J., Der Sprachgebrauch des Dialekt-Schriftstellers Frank Robinson zu Bowness in Westmoreland. (Palaestra, cxvi.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M. 50.

Suddard, S. J. M., Essais de littérature anglaise. Cambridge, University Press. 5*s.* net.

Suddard, S. J. M., Keats, Shelley and Shakespeare: Studies and Essays in English Literature. Cambridge, University Press. 6*s.* net.

Taylor, H. V., Letters of Great Writers, from the time of Spenser to the time of Wordsworth, edited by. London, Blackie. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Walters, J. S., Mrs Humphry Ward: her work and influence. London, Kegan Paul. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Willoughby, L. A., Dante Gabriel Rossetti and German Literature. A public Lecture. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1*s.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General.*

Behn, S., Der deutsche Rhythmus und sein eigenes Gesetz. Eine experimentelle Untersuchung. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 6 M. 50.

Kluge, F., Wortforschung und Wortgeschichte. Aufsätze zum deutschen Sprachschatz. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 3 M. 60.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Förstemann, E., Altdeutsches Namenbuch, ii. 3te Auflage von H. Jellinghaus. 2.—4. Lieferung. Bonn, Hanstein. Each 5 M.

Hartmann von Aue, Der arme Heinrich. Herausgegeben von H. Paul. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, iii.) 5. Auflage. Halle, Niemeyer. 50 pf.

Konrad von Würzburg, Engelhard. Herausgegeben von P. Gereke. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, xvii.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Mittelhochdeutsche Novellen. i. Die Heidin. ii. Rittertreue. Schlegel. Herausgegeben von L. Pfannmüller. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, xcii, xcv.) Bonn, Marcus und Weber. 1 M. 20 and 1 M. 50.

Oswald, Der Wiener. Herausgegeben von G. Baesecke. (Germanische Bibliothek, iii. Abt., Kritische Ausgaben altdeutscher Texte, ii.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M. 20.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Berendsohn, W. A., Stil und Form der Aphorismen Lichtenbergs. Kiel, W. G. Mühlau. 3 M. 50.

Bieber, H., J. A. Schlegels poetische Theorie, in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange untersucht. (Palaestra, cxiv.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M. 50.

Brentano, C., Romanzen vom Rosenkranz. Unter erstmaliger Benutzung des gesamten handschriftlichen Materials, herausgegeben und eingeleitet von A. M. von Steinle. Trier, Petrus-Verlag. 5 M. 50.

Burchinal, M. C., Hans Sachs and Goethe. A Study in Meter. (Hesperia, ii.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 M. 80.

Frank, E., Rezensionen über schöne Literatur von Schelling und Caroline in der neuen jenaischen Literatur-Zeitung. (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

FREILIGRATH, F., Werke. Herausgegeben von P. Zaunert. 2 Bände. (Meyers Klassiker-Ausgabe.) Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut. 4 M.

GADIENT, P. V., Prokop von Templin. Sein Leben und seine Werke. (Deutsche Quellen und Studien, III.) Regensburg, J. Habbel. 6 M.

Goethe-Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben von L. Geiger. XXXIII. Band. Frankfort o. M., Literarische Anstalt. 10 M.

KÖRNCHEN, H., Zesens Romane. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Romans im 17. Jahrhundert. (Palaestra, CXV.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 80.

KÜHNEMANN, E., Herder. 2te neu bearbeitete Auflage. Munich, C. H. Beck. 8 M.

LEITZMANN, A., Die Quellen von Schillers Wilhelm Tell. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, XC.) Bonn, Marcus und Weber. 1 M. 20.

LENAU, N., Sämtliche Werke und Briefe. Herausgegeben von E. Castle. IV. Band (Briefe, II.). Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 5 M.

LUTHER, M., Sämtliche deutsche geistliche Lieder. In der Reihenfolge ihrer ersten Drucke herausgegeben von F. Klippgen. (Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrh., CCXXX.) Halle, Niemeyer. 60 pf.

PORT, F., Hermann Lingg. Eine Lebensgeschichte. Munich, C. H. Beck. 4 M. 50.

ROSALEWSKI, W., Schillers Ästhetik im Verhältnis zur Kantischen. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 60.

SCHAAFFS, G., Goethes Hero und Leander und Schillers romantisches Gedicht. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 4 M. 50.

SCHAAFFS, G., Goethes Schatzgräber und die Weissagungen des Bakis. Leipzig, A. Weigel. 5 M.

SCHADE, O., Faust. Vom Ursprung bis zur Verklärung durch Goethe. Herausgegeben von R. Schade. Berlin, K. Curtius. 7 M. 50.

SCHILLER, J. F., Anthologie-Gedichte. Herausgegeben von W. Stammler. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, XCIII.) Bonn, Marcus und Weber. 1 M. 50.

SCHINDLER, K., Die Technik des Aktschlusses im neueren deutschen Drama mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des 18. Jahrh. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 2 M. 40.

SCHURIG, A., Der junge Heinse. Munich, G. Müller. 2 M. 50

STRAUSS, B., Der Übersetzer Nicolaus von Wyle. (Palaestra, CXVIII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M. 80.

TODT, W., Lessing in England, 1767–1850. (Anglistische Arbeiten, I.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 80.

VULLIOD, A., P. Rosegger. L'Homme et l'œuvre. (Bibliothèque de philologie et de littérature modernes.) Paris, F. Alcan. 10 fr.

WODICK, W., J. Ayrers Dramen in ihrem Verhältnis zur einheimischen Literatur und zum Schauspiel der englischen Komödianten. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

ZÜRCHER, O., Jens Baggesens Parthenais. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, XI.) Leipzig, H. Haessel. 3 M.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PB
1
M65
v.7

The Modern language review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY